

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

EDITED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND EGYPTOLOGY, TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO, ONT., CANADA.

IN COLLABORATION WITH JOHN A. MAYNARD, BRYN MAWR COLLEGE,
BRYN MAWR, PA.

Volume XI

JANUARY, 1927

Number 1

THE HAIR-OFFERING

By H. H. GOWEN, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

ONE of the most treasured of Gospel sayings recommends trust in an Almighty Providence in the words: "The very hairs of your head are all numbered." Probably, the first suggestion of the saying is in the assurance that the very least and most insignificant things relating to the individual life are nevertheless the special objects of divine care. That sense is of course implicit. Yet it will, I believe, also appear that few things intimately connected with this body of ours have gathered around them so many associations of dignity and value as this seemingly so insignificant hair of our heads. Possibly these associations may at first seem heterogeneous and unrelated, but, properly appreciated, they will be found to confirm very wonderfully the truth of the saying quoted, linking as they do our life below with the source of life above.

In this paper I run the risk at the outset of appearing to be merely assembling from various directions a promiscuous array of references to hair and hair customs such as may seem irreducible to any consistent principle of selection. Yet, on closer investigation, I hope a principle will be discerned which enables us to synthesise the individual elements of our collected material and even cast some light on the interest taken in our hair by God Himself.

Hair as power: First, a multitude of instances will come to mind in which a remarkable degree of power is attributed to hair, and in particular to the hair of the head. The first and ultimate reason for this may be a matter of speculation. Possibly, men noted, from very primitive times, the strange power that hair possessed of constant growth, in spite of repeated clippings, and, in certain cases, continuing even after the death of the body.

Whether this be so or not, from the earliest times, as Mr. CLODD states (*Magic in Names*, p. 17), there has been a general belief that abundant hair is evidence of unusual vigor, and even (as some musicians have been not unwilling to have believed) of unusual genius. Pride in a fine head of hair is not all vanity. Even the young girl whose avarice is exposed in BROWNING's *Gold Hair* must have had some sincerity in her plea for "the last, last grace, my all, my own." E. V. HOPKINS (*History of Religion*, p. 89) affirms: "Hair is an index of vigor, vitality, ability. Hence the Mandan (Siouan) with the longest hair became a chief. Horsehairs were sometimes utilized to lengthen a man's own hair and aid him in securing leadership." PAUL DU CHAILLU is quoted to the effect that when his hair had been shorn in Equatorial Africa there was a general scramble for the cuttings in which even the king Olenda joined. "I called him" says the traveller, "and asked him what was the use of the hair. He answered, 'O Spirit, these hairs are very precious; we shall make mandas (fetishes) of them and they will bring other white men and good luck and riches'." (*Adventures in Equatorial Africa*, p. 427.) CLODD (*op. cit.*) also writes: "Among the Hos of Togoland there are priests on whose heads no razor has come throughout their life. The god who dwells in the man forbids the shearing of his hair under threat of death. If the hair grows too long, the owner must pray to his god to let him at least clip the ends of it. For the hair is conceived as the seat and abode of the god: were it cut off the god would lose his dwelling." FRAZER (*Folk-lore of the O. T.*, II 484) gives several additional illustrations of this belief. "Thus the natives of Amboyna, an island in the East Indies, used to think that their strength was in their hair and would desert them if their locks were shorn. A criminal under torture in a Dutch court of that island persisted in denying his guilt till his hair was cut off, when he immediately confessed. One man who was tried for murder endured without flinching the utmost ingenuity of his torturers till he saw the surgeon standing by with a pair of shears." There is also the story of the chief who was captured by the Sultan of Johore but who could not be executed, though they tried with fire and sword to slay him, until there was discovered on his head a hair as hard as wire. When this was plucked, death followed naturally. We are reminded in this story of GEORGE

MEREDITH's *Shaving of Shagpat* and of the attempt on "the Identical." We may well exclaim with a personage in the story: "Hair! hair! there is might in hair." A very good example of the association of hair with strength at the present day is to be found in the case of the Japanese wrestlers. Says Mr. D. C. HOLTOM (*Political Philosophy of Modern Shinto*, p. 165): "The Japanese wrestler, to whom superior physical prowess is a prime necessity, still wears his hair long. When the successful wrestler retires from the ring, his hair is cut in a dignified religious ceremony. The cuttings of the hair are offered to the *kami* on the family god-shelf, or, more often, presented at the shrine of Nomi-no-sukune, the patron god of wrestlers." The *Order of Service for the Hair-cutting ceremony* in this case is quite an impressive piece of ritual.

Even after death the hair retains its virtue and, no doubt, this is why, as Dr. ROBERTSON SMITH tells us (*Religion of the Semites*, p. 325); Muhammad's hair was preserved and worn by his followers on their persons. One such hair was a treasured relic in the Mosque of the Companion at Cairawan. ENTHOVEN (*Folk-lore of Bombay*, p. 289) reminds us that it was customary in certain parts of India to cut off a lock from a child's hair and keep it for the purpose of satisfying the longing of a barren woman for a child. Something of the same idea lies behind the belief in the efficacy of hair, particularly that of a woman, which prevails in Japan. Visitors to the famous Higashi (Eastern) Hongwanji of Kyōto will remember the ropes of human hair, contributed by the sacrificial devotion of 30,000 women in the province, furnished to provide a cable strong enough to lift the great beams with which the temple is constructed. Well does the monk KENKŌ write in his delightful *Tzuredzure Gusa*: "It is said that with a rope in which are twisted strands of a woman's hair the mighty elephant may be bound."

In quite another way is the power of hair illustrated by the popular superstition that a man may save himself from the worst consequences of a dog's bite by taking a hair of the dog which bit him, or in the very numerous Fairy Tales (e.g. the Serbian stories of *The Golden Apple Tree* and the *Three Brothers*) where horses, dogs, wolves and bears, or, on occasion, an old woman, offer a single hair which rubbed in hour of need, or placed in the fire, brings help and salvation.

Theories: When we ask for the reasons underlying this attribution of magical power, such as leads men to guard so carefully their hair, or to sacrifice it as a special act of devotion, we are confronted with several quite different theories.

i. The theory sometimes adduced that care of the hair arises merely from the desire to retain the body intact, to the last hair, for the day of judgement, may be at once dismissed. No doubt instances of this belief may be brought forward, as in the village of Drumconrath in Ireland where there "used to be some old women who, having ascertained from Scripture that the hairs of their head were all numbered by the Almighty, expected to have to account for them at the day of judgement. In order to be able to do so they stuffed the severed hair away in the thatch of their cottage." (See FRAZER, *Golden Bough*.) In such a case the habit went deeper than the expressed belief which is, of course, an afterthought.

ii. There is the belief that the hair, as a living and important part of the body, is under the control of a spirit who will be annoyed at any liberties taken with his place of abode.

iii. It is thought that special value attaches to the hair as a means for establishing relations with the dead. Hair may be interchanged as a keepsake with a deceased kinsman or a kinsman god, as with a living friend. Such an exchange provides an avenger of blood in case of need. Of the establishing and maintaining of communion with the dead by depositing a lock of hair in or upon the grave we shall have some examples presently.

iv. Others hold that the offering of hair to the dead was not only a means of establishing communion, but also a channel for the impartation of strength and life, just as nourishment was provided for the pallid ghosts of the underworld in Homer by filling the trenches with sacrificial blood.

All these last-named theories have some relation to the point I especially desire to illustrate, but, before coming to this, it may be well to bring together a few out of the many examples of hair-cult which offer themselves in order to throw light upon the separate elements which must needs be included in our survey.

Hair as strength: That hair is regarded as indicative of physical vigor we have already seen. A few more illustrations may conveniently be given. Bible instances will at once occur in the cases of

Samson and Absalom. Samson (Jud. xiii-xvi) loses his strength when his hair is shorn and recovers it for the last tragic act of his life when it has grown again. Of Absalom we are told, with admiring detail: "When he polled his head (for it was at every year's end that he polled it; because the hair was heavy on him therefore he polled it:) he weighed the hair of his head at two hundred shekels after the king's weight" (II Sam. xiv 26). It will be remembered also that when the prophet Ezekiel acted out in parable the catastrophe to come upon Judah with the invasion of Nebuchadrezzar, he cut his hair, divided it into three parts, scattered a third to the wind, smote a third with the sword, and secreted the rest in his girdle to portray the fate of the different sections of the nation. In Japanese myth we have the story of the storm-god Susa-no-o, expelled from the High Plain of Heaven for outrage on his sister, the Sun Goddess, his hair cut off and his nails plucked out, in order to deprive him of his strength. The same belief prevailed in ancient Rome, so that the Flamen Dialis was supposed to depend upon his hair for strength. Also among the Indians of certain British Columbia tribes, who maintained that they would grow weak if they cut off their hair. The old German idea was that a boy's hair must not be cut before the age of seven, lest he should lose his courage. Tacitus refers to the same belief when he affirms (*Germ.* 31) that the Chatti never cut their hair till they had proved the possession of courage. The belief is especially stressed in the demand for the depilation of witches before their execution. FRAZER (*Folk-lore of O. T.*, II 485) writes as follows: "Here in Europe it used to be thought that the maleficent powers of witches and wizards resided in their hair, and that nothing could make any impression on these miscreants so long as they kept their hair on. Hence in France it was customary to shave the whole bodies of persons charged with sorcery before handing them over to the tormentor. Millaeus witnessed the torture of some persons at Toulouse, from whom no confession could be wrung until they were stripped and completely shaven, when they readily acknowledged the truth of the charge.... The noted inquisitor Sprenger contented himself with shaving the head of the suspected witch or warlock; but his more thorough-going colleague Cumanus shaved the whole bodies of forty-one women before committing them all to the flames. He had high authority

for this rigorous scrutiny, since Satan himself, in a sermon preached from the pulpit of North Berwick Church, comforted his many servants by assuring them that no harm could befall them 'sa lang as their hair wes on, and sould nevir latt ane teir fall fra thair ene'." Similar drastic dealing is described as used in the case of men and women adjudged guilty of witchcraft at Bastar in India; in the case of the Bhils, among whom a lock of hair is taken from the head of the suspect "that the last link between her and her former powers of mischief might be broken" (W. CROOKE, *Popular Religion and Folk-lore of Northern India*, II 281); and of the Aztecs of Mexico, among whom the hair of the head was cropped in the case of witches "which took from them all their power of sorcery and enchantment, and then it was that by death they put an end to their odious existence." (B. DE SAHAGUN, *Histoire des choses de la Nouvelle Espagne*, p. 274.) ENTHOVEN (*Folk-lore of Bombay*, p. 238) tells us that a witch casts her spells while she is combing her hair and therefore "it is a safeguard to cut off the ends of witches' hair and keep them in custody." Even supernatural beings might be adversely affected by interference with their hair. R. E. ENTHOVEN (*op. cit.*, p. 158) tells us that a spirit may be brought under control by cutting off a lock of its hair or top-knot and keeping it. The trophy should be kept inside the right thigh by making an incision in the flesh, even as Jesus, according to the *Toldoth Yesu*, is fabled to have kept the stolen Tetragrammaton in a hole in his thigh and thereby possessed the power of working miracles. Slavic legend affirms that a Vila (fairy) will show herself in her true shape to anyone who succeeds in cutting off her hair (JAN MACHAL, *Slavic Mythology*, p. 258). In quite another direction, namely, in the west of China, we have the legend of the Flying Horse given by Va-sa-neh to his son-in-law Oo-meng. "Taking it back home with him, his officers were very anxious to see what the horse was like. One of these remarked that the horse was far too shaggy and would look much better if its mane were cut. This advice was forthwith followed and, as in the case of the O. T. hero Samson, with the cutting of the hair the wonderful powers departed." With the loss of its powers the poor beast lost its value and at last, in trying to fly as of old, it fell to the bottom of a ravine and was dashed to pieces. (S. POLLARD, *In Unknown China*, p. 134.)

Hair and liberty: We are all familiar with the general governmental habit of giving prisoners "a close crop" on their consignment to jail, but seldom reflect that this hair-cutting is a definitely symbolic act, signifying the withdrawal from its victims of personal liberty. Many illustrations occur of this, one—to start with—from the Old Testament (II Sam. x 4) where David's envoys are shaven by Hanun in order to reduce them, and by implication their master, to the status slaves. Several instances of similar symbolic action are given by HERBERT SPENCER (*Princ. of Soc.*, IV ch. 3). For example, tributary chieftains in Fiji were forced to cut off their tobe, or pigtail lock, before approaching a master. Among Greeks and Romans slaves "had their hair cut short as a mark of servitude." BANCROFT says of the Nootkas: "Socially the slave is despised, his hair is cut short." "The privilege of long hair is rigorously denied to Carib slaves." In Nicaragua a chieftain had his hair cut off and became a slave to the person who had been robbed till he was satisfied. To pull a man's hair was to treat him as a slave; hence, among the Kalmucks, "when one pulls another by the pigtail, or actually tears it out, this is regarded as a punishable offence, because the pigtail is thought to belong to the chief." Sometimes voluntary humility is shown by allowing the hair to be cut, as when "Charles Martel sent Pepin, his son, to Liuthprand, king of the Lombards, that he might cut his first locks, and by this ceremony hold for the future the place of his father."

The depriving of men of liberty by interfering with their right to their own hair is well illustrated by the Manchu treatment of the Chinese after the conquest of 1644. There is a common misunderstanding, however, of the Manchu edict. It was not, as frequently assumed, a command to wear the queue, but an order to shave the front of the head, leaving one single lock behind. The Chinese had been accustomed to wear their hair long, and it is interesting to note that when the T'ai-pings, in the mid-nineteenth century, rose against Manchu domination they at once resumed the habit of wearing their hair long, whence they were dubbed 'Chang Mao (Long-haired) Rebels. A parallel case is found in the attempt on the part of the last Emperor of Korea to abolish the "top-knot" of his subjects. The edict was passively resisted by a multitude which lay prone in supplication all day and all night until the objectionable order was revoked.

Hair and life: The power over a subject's hair was regarded, not only as a sign of authority over liberty, but also as indicative of authority over life. Several illustrations of this have already been adduced, but two or three others will be useful. Readers of the classics will remember that when Scylla, daughter of Nisus, pulled out the golden lock of her father, she found that upon this lock his life had depended. In the history of China occurs an incident, about the 4th century A.D. which has often been regarded either as a pleasantry or an evasion of justice. It was when a certain ruler condemned himself to death for breaking a law which forbade riding through the standing crops, and subsequently commuted the punishment to the less inconvenient operation of cutting off his hair. It is forgotten that the one, in the case of a chief especially, was looked upon as equivalent to the other. Of similar import was the cutting off of the hair of an adulteress among certain tribes who recognized the enormity of the crime and its traditional penalty but were a little reluctant to adopt too harsh a measure. Here again it was felt that the old law had been carried out, at least in spirit. ROBERTSON SMITH tells us that if an Arab dreams that his hair is cut off, he at once accepts it as an omen of approaching death. The identification of life with the hair is strikingly illustrated by a statement made by the Russian Captain GOLOWNIN in his *Japan and the Japanese* (II 241). He there quotes a Japanese, "Tachatay Kachi," as follows: "I therefore cut the tuft of hair from the crown of my head and laid it in the box which contained the portrait. This, according to our Japanese custom, signifies that he who sends his hair in this manner to his friends has died an honorable death; that is to say has ripped open his bowels. His hair is then buried with all the ceremonies which would be observed at the interment of his body." (Cf. the burial of the single hair of Sanetomo, son of Yoritomo.)

The loss of hair as the equivalent of death appears also in the depicting of Mexican God of Death, Mictlantecutli, as Tzontemoc, "he of the falling hair." (H. B. ALEXANDER, *Latin-American Mythology*, p. 80.) Among the Slavs a Wili (fairy) inevitably dies upon the loss of a single hair. The Red men of the American plains conceived of no better way in which to express their conviction that the life of the enemy was actually in their hands than by taking the foeman's scalp. Death itself is frequently represented as insisting

upon the scalp-lock of a victim as a sign of dominion over the sons of men. Readers will recall such instances as in the *Alcestis* of Euripides (74) where Thanatos, like a sacrificing priest, comes to take the tuft of hair from the head of the devoted wife of Admetus:

“στέλγω δ’ ἐπ’ αὐτὴν ὡς κατάρξωμαι ξίφει·
 ἱερὸς γὰρ οὗτος τῶν κατὰ χθονὸς Θεῶν·
 ὃ του τόδ’ ἔγχος κρατὸς ἀγνίστη τριχᾶ.”

Proserpine performs a like function for the doomed Dido (*Aeneid* iv 698):

“Nondum illi flavum Proserpine vertice crinem
 Abstulerat, Stygioque caput sacraverat Orco.”

And the principle was recognized even in the sacrifice of beasts, where the hair cut from the victim's head and cast into the altar fires was regarded as the *primitiae* of the sacrifice:

“Et summas carpens media inter cornua setas
 Ignibus imponit sacris, libamina prima.”

It was natural that men to whom had come the equation of loss of hair and loss of life should take the further step of supposing that a voluntary giving up of their hair must be equivalent to the relinquishing of life itself to the power divine.

The hair-offering to the dead: No more striking ritualisation of an idea can be imagined than this order to show that the living were willing to sacrifice themselves for the dead. So Orestes made the offering of his hair at the tomb of his father (*Aesch. Choeph.* 6). So the Persians cut the hair even of their horses after the death of a general as though to show that these too were sacrificially devoted to the dead (*Herod.* ix 24). So the Semitic tribes were wont to do until the tendency to sacrifice thus to the dead became obnoxious enough to Yahwism to bring about the prohibition of Lev. xix 27: “Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard. Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead.” The tearing of the hair which in many lands and in all ages has been so characteristic an act of lamentation for the dead, as when Hekabe, wailing for Hector, “tore her hair and cast far from her

her shining veil" (*Il.* xxii 407), or when Achilles and his friends heaped their hair on the tomb of Patroclus, was not a mere spontaneous act of unreasoning grief, but a quite considered and deliberate piece of ritual whereby the life of the mourner was offered for the aiding of the dead. And the same thought lies behind many of the incidents that belong to much later times. As in ancient Egypt (WILKINSON, *Anc. Eg.* ii 21) for a woman's hair to be cut off and laid in the grave, or (ii 339) for the hair of an attached relative to be buried with the mummy; for Arab women to lay their tresses on the tombs of the dead (ROBERTSON SMITH, *Rel. of Sem.*, 325), established "an enduring covenant between the living and the dead," so in modern times we have the case of Wagner's widow cutting off her hair and placing it in her husband's coffin. As WILLIAM WATSON sings:

"Her head's bright harvest, shorn, she laid in the mould,
Flooding death's emptiness with billowy gold.
He sleeps; and in his earthly dreams can see
Her lustrous love illumine eternity."

Not less apropos, though recorded in fiction, is DISRAELI's description in *Endymion* of how Lady Roehampton (Lady Palmerston) cut off her own long tresses and placed them in the coffin round her dead husband's neck (*Endymion*, p. 398). In the case of negro mourners in certain countries not only the hair of the head is shaved off but a kind of general depilation attempted. In certain cases the hair of an enemy is accounted an even more fitting offering to the dead than that of friends and associates. Thus, to stimulate the vigor of dead warriors among the Osage tribe nothing is thought so effective as the hanging of the hair of a dead enemy upon his grave.

Hair-offering to the gods: From offerings to the dead to offerings to the gods is but a step, since so many of the gods are but the deified spirits of the dead. A very general idea was to dedicate children to the gods by the sacrifice of their first hair. The Abipones, on the birth of a child, cut a patch of hair from the forehead as a sign of honor paid to the god (DOBRIZHOFFER). There was a similar custom among the Slavs (TYLOR), and, between the age of two and five, among the Bhils (CROOKE). An ancient Brahmanic rite of the same kind was expressly for the purpose

of securing long life. The first hair of an Egyptian boy was regarded as sacred to the gods and a sacrificial feast of a goat was held to celebrate the first cutting (LANE, *Mod. Eg.*, 573). The same writer speaks of the custom of giving an alms to the poor the weight of hair subsequently cut, in silver and gold. "Among the Hindus (ENTHOVEN, *Folk-lore of Bombay*, p. 79) it is customary for those who have lost children to keep subsequent infants unshaved for a number of years. They are then taken to a holy place and there shaved for the first time with special ceremonies." The same writer (*op. cit.*, p. 233) describes how the children of another district are taken to Ambaji there to have their hair ceremonially cut for the first time. Miss CANDEE (*Angkor, the Magnificent*, p. 211) relates that in French Indo-China "some wore a forelock like a tiny patch of fur above the brow. These were the boys, and they would wear this ornament on their shaved heads until reaching the age of ten or so, when they would be taken before a certain statue of Buddha in great Angkor Vat to have it cut, with show of ceremony."

In some countries the ceremonial hair-cutting was later in life. The Greek *ephebi* offered the long hair of their childhood to the god at Delphi, so proceeding to the privileges of manhood. (Cf. *νεῦρος* from *νεῖρω*.) Lucian speaks of the Syrian boys and girls dedicating their hair at certain sanctuaries where the offering was placed in caskets of gold or silver. It must have been in such a box, as Petronius, in the *Satyricon*, tells us, that Trimalchio deposited his first beard,—"*pyxis aurea non pusilla, in quo barbam ipsius conditam esse dicebant.*" Some such gift to the gods is also involved in the statement that the Phoenician maidens, as a preliminary to marriage, were required, at the Feast of Byblus, to sacrifice either their hair or their chastity.

In cases not a few the hair-offering was made under compulsion or from fear. Thus we are told of the West African practice on the Gold Coast in which the taking of an oath involved "eating fetish," or else the depositing of a lock of hair in the abode of the god. Readers of the classics will remember how Petronius, in the *Satyricon*, describes some of the sailors as getting shaved as the last offering of a doomed crew (*nafragorum ultimum votum*) and how angry some of the rest were at this expression of despair,—"*Itane capillos aliquis in nave praecidit, et hoc nocte intempesta?*"

Hair vows: In a large number of cases, however, the hair-offering was voluntary and sprang out of real devotion to a god or expressed some particular vow. "Of the abstentions observed by votaries, those which had relation to the barber's art were the commonest. Wherever individuals were concerned to create or confirm a tie connecting them with a god, a shrine, or a particular religious circle, a hair-offering was in some form or other imperative." (*Enc. Br., sub voce Vow.*) Illustrations are almost too numerous to mention. Suffice it to cull from Greek story the incident of Achilles, through his father Peleus, consecrating his hair to the river Spercheus and his vow not to cut it till he should return safe from Troy. Or that of Orestes offering a lock of his hair "for nurture" to the River Inachus. In Muhammadan law a man might be consecrated, vowing neither to have his hair washed or cut until he had fulfilled his vow and might be released from the consecrated state. Buddhism teems with illustrations of vows similarly made and similarly discharged.

But the best known instances and those most significant for our purpose are to be found in the Hebrew vow of the Nazirite and in the tonsure of the Christian priesthood.

As to the former, it is very obvious that the original meaning of the root from which Nazirite is derived, was "to encircle," "to defend," and so "to consecrate." ROBERTSON SMITH (equating the נזר with נדר and the Arabic *nadhara*, *Rel. of Sem.*, p. 483) affirms that "the offering of hair by the warriors on the way to battle was the leaving of a soul token with the kinsman god, who was thus interested in the avenging." It was certainly a formal dedication of life to the service of God. Both in the case of the shaving of the heads of the Egyptian priests and in the preservation of the hair of the Hebrew Nazirite the significance was the same. In either case it was life dedicated to God. If the Nazirite vow was made for a season only (as in Acts xxi 24), the hair when shorn was burned on the altar. The law of the Nazirite is contained in Num. vi 5-21, and regards the one who takes the vow as being distinctly separated "unto Yahweh." "The consecration of his God is upon his head." It was not necessarily life-long, but whenever the vow terminated the hair was formally sacrificed. Instances of life-long vows are, in the O. T., Samson and Samuel, and, in the N. T., John the Baptist (probably). These were devoted to God from birth,

even as the firstling sheep was devoted which, according to Deut. xv 19, must not be shorn. It should be borne in mind, of course, that the laws of the Pentateuch respecting the Nazirite vow are in no sense original, but represent rather the regulation of usages sanctioned by long custom and supported by tradition.

The custom corresponding to the Nazirite vow in the history of Christendom is that of the tonsure, which possibly has Egyptian rather than Hebrew affinities, though, as we have seen, symbolising the same consecration of life to the service of God. Prudentius (*Περί* xiii 30) speaks of it as in his time customary for the clergy to have their hair cut at ordination. Paulinus describes it as in his time the custom of the Western Church. Sidonius Apollinarius (iv 13) speaks of Bp. Germanicus as having his hair cut "in rotæ specie." The earliest ecclesiastical precept on the subject is Canon 41 of the Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, and we learn that children and secular adults often received the tonsure without ordination. Already there had grown up controversy between the Churches deriving from Rome and those from the East respecting the shape which the tonsure should properly assume. In the initiation of Eastern monks, after the novice had been denuded of all things belonging to his former life, his hair was polled "cross-wise by way of consecrating it." The presiding monk, who was called the "father of the hair," collects the shorn locks and places them under the altar. Then the tonsured novice is taken to the altar, a taper in either hand, and offered as "a rational whole-burnt-offering, as mystic frankincense, as voluntary homage and worship."

The principle of the tonsure as it affected men is in the case of women represented by the cutting off of the hair of the professed nun. The long hair of a woman represented to the Jew the life she owed to her husband, and so was a sign of subjection (I Cor. xi 2 ff.). It was for this reason that a woman was, in public, to keep her hair covered, since her obedience was vowed to her husband alone. The *ἐξουσία*, whatever this may be taken to mean, upon her head was, moreover, so that no wandering spirits might obtain power over her through the hair as a "soul-seat." Rabbi Simeon said: "If a woman's head (or hair) is uncovered, evil spirits come and sit upon it, and destroy everything in the house." The change often made in the dressing of a woman's hair after marriage is of course connected with this and similar beliefs.

Hair used in sorcery: From the importance attached to the placing of life in the hands of God, whether out of a desire to gain security from His acceptance of a trust or out of the simple spirit of devotion, it may be seen that it must be equally important to prevent the hair from falling into the power of a hostile or malevolent personality, human or spiritual. Many customs spring out of the desire to avoid adverse possession of this kind. It is true that hair, being the depository of life, might sometime be used as a charm in a general sense, without evil design. For example, W. J. PERRY (*Origin of Magic and Religion*, p. 161) mentions a bundle of charms seen in a Borneo village containing "hair taken from the heads that hang in the gallery," together with other things, crocodile's teeth, stone axe-heads, &c. Mr. ENTHOVEN (*Folk-lore of Bombay*, p. 4) says: "The burning of a hair from the head of the owner of the evil eye, or one of his eye-lashes, is held to ward off the evil influence." Again (*op. cit.*, p. 286), the same writer tells us how "in the Kanarese country women swallow a scorpion cooked in butter and a lock of a child's hair similarly cooked to cure barrenness." Yet the general assumption is that when hair is stolen it is for employment in "black art," in order that the *mana* contained in it (*makt stulna*, as Dr. SODERBLOM calls it) may be used for the hurt of the person from whom it was stolen. Hence the care of the Roman Flamen Dialis to bury the cuttings of his hair under a fruit tree, lest they should be used against him (*Aul. Gell.* x 15). On certain days a particular power of hurt was supposed to lurk in any parings of nails or clippings of hair left carelessly about. Of this speaks the rhyme:

"It were better you were never born
Than on the Sabbath pare hare or horn."

Even spirits could take advantage of this particular form of carelessness. CLODD (*Magic in Names*, p. 17) quotes the Avesta to this effect: "Which is the most deadly deed whereby a man increases most the baleful strength of the Daevas? It is when a man here below, combing his hair or shaving it off, or paring off his nails, drops them into a hole or crack."

Keeping the hair of kings and priests: The converse side to this fear of putting a part of one's soul into the power of the enemy is to be found in the special efforts made to keep one's

hair inviolate. In this effort we discover many of the customs which hedged about kings and others specially delegated with power from on high.

The king's hair was sacred not only in the interest of the individual but in that of the whole community. In consequence it was necessary to take special measures to protect it from loss or defilement. For this reason the fillet was used to bind the royal hair together and the fillet eventually became the crown which still remains one of the distinctive insignia of royalty. In addition to the fillet there was in certain cases a marking of the hair with a circle of red, since red was esteemed the demon-scaring color. Sometimes it was sufficient to make a parting of the hair with vermillion or red earth. Of the sacredness of the Emperor's hair in Japan KAEMPFER writes (*Hist. of Japan*, I, p. 261): "There is such a Holiness ascrib'd to all the parts of his Body, that he dares not cut off, neither his Hair, nor his Beard, nor his Nails. However, lest he should grow too dirty, they may clean him in the night, when he is asleep, because they say that what is taken from his Body at that time hath been stolen from him, and that such a theft doth not prejudice his Holiness or Dignity." Elsewhere, the greatest possible ceremony attended the process of trimming the royal locks. To quote from FRAZER (*Art. Taboo*, En. Br.) respecting Polynesian usage: "The head and hair, especially of a chief, were particularly taboo or sacred—to touch a man's head was a gross insult. If a chief touched his own head with his fingers he had immediately to apply them to his nose to snuff up the sanctity which they had abstracted from his head. The cutting of a chief's hair was a solemn ceremony—the several locks were collected and buried in a sacred place or hung up on a tree." The same thing may be said of the hair-cutting of the kings of Burmah (see HASTINGS, *E. R. E.*, Art. *Hair and Nails*). The American Indian chief, according to Miss ALICE FLETCHER (*Handbook of Am. Ind.*), was particularly sensitive on the subject of his scalp-lock. "For anyone to touch lightly this lock was regarded as a grave insult." The hair-cutting of an Indian king is ceremonially described in the Çatapatha Brahmana. Before his inauguration a king must not have his hair cut for a whole year. Moreover, no one in the kingdom, except a priest, might have his hair cut during this period. Even the animals had to go unclipped. Similar

ceremonial importance attached to the hair-washing of a king, as in the case of the Indian Emperor Açoka, whose annual hair-washing has been thought of as borrowed from Achaemenian use, but may really represent a much more general custom. It is clear that much was thought to depend upon the hair of a monarch. Great pride was taken in its abundance and it seems probable that Absalom's pride in his luxuriant tresses was not a mere sign of youthful vanity but really an exhibition of kingly pretension. Much could be effected by means of the magical power resident in the hair. When the Japanese Sun Goddess was preparing herself for the encounter with her uproarious brother the Storm God, we are told that she unbound "her august hair" and twisted it again into "august bunches." Later on, the famous Empress Jingo, planning to proceed to the conquest of Korea, divined with her august hair, permitting the waves of the sea to part her locks into two evenly arranged masses. Even the ornaments of the hair, particularly the comb, were full of *mana*. As mermaids work their spells upon mariners while combing their tresses, so the Japanese deities worked wonders with their combs. Izanagi, emerging from Hades, whence he had attempted to deliver his dead wife, held back the hags of hell by making use of his hair ornaments and his head-dress. Susa-no-o, protecting the maiden Kushinada no Hime from the Eight-headed Serpent, transformed her into a comb which he placed in his hair, thus making her inviolable. Hair-combing episodes, says H. B. ALEXANDER (*North American Mythology*, p. 302), are frequent in myth, usually with a magic significance. In Iroquois cosmogony Ataentsic combs the hair of her father, apparently to receive his magic power.

The sacrosanctity of the royal hair is also no doubt implied in the story of Gautama cutting his hair with his sword when renouncing kingship in favor of the ascetic life,—“as no one was worthy to touch his head.” “May my hair” he prayed, “thus cut be neat and even,” and by the force of his prayer the hair parted evenly, leaving each hair about an inch and a half in length, and they curled in right-handed spirals, and never grew more to the last day of his life (THOMPSON'S *Siam*, p. 102). Yet, as Buddha, Gautama still possessed a mark of his divine commission in the *urṇa*, a wool-like circle of hair upon his forehead. The *urṇa*, it is believed, was derived from the little circlet of hair

upon the forehead of the bull. We are reminded that Moschus speaks of Europa's bull as having this magical "silver-white circle" upon its brow.

As has been already implied the sacredness of the hair attributed to kings was shared by priests. These too held in their persons a supply of *mana* which had to be carefully protected against sacrilege. The High Priests of the Jews were warned against letting their hair flow loose, that is, unbound (Lev. xxi 10), in the same way as, according to Aulus Gellius, the hair of the Flamen Dialis had to be protected.

Even Prophets shared in the association of their sacred commission with an abundance of hair. Elijah was the more esteemed as a messenger of God because he was "a lord of hair" (II K. i 8). Elisha, on the other hand, suffered by comparison even in the judgement of the children who ran after and mocked him, "Go up, thou bald-head!" (II K. ii 23). It was a reflection on the expectation that the prophet could carry the double part of seer and courtier.

Hair and the Divine: We are gradually being led to the conclusion that a vigorous growth of hair was not merely a sign of physical prowess but actual proof of close association with the Divine.

Perhaps this is most clearly shown in connection with certain Japanese beliefs. Dr. M. HONDA, writing of *Ōmoto-kyō* (quoted by D. C. HOLTOM, *The Political Philosophy of Modern Shinto*, p. 165), has said: "The *Ōmoto* believers claim as a proof of the Japanese race being the god's chosen people for the moral unification of entire humanity, that our hair has pith right up to the end, while the white-skinned people's hair is dead three or four inches from its end. This is why, they say, we Japanese are more susceptible to spiritual influences than any other race, the hair being the receiver of spiritual messages. They therefore keep their hair at least three inches long, bound together as close to the head as possible and let down the back when it is long enough."

This idea serves to explain the fact that the word *kami* signifies at once "hair" and "the gods." It has generally been asserted that the double use arises from the original meaning of the word being "something which is above," applicable to the hair on the top of the head and to the gods in heaven. There are, however,

says Mr. HOLTOM, "important considerations which bear against this interpretation. These considerations have to do with the fact that the hair on the human scalp is one of the principal objects of ceremonial treatment in Japan and, in both ancient and modern usage, presents aspects that would appear to justify an association with primitive supernaturalism or at least with the idea of mysterious human force." (*Op. cit.*, p. 162.)

Hair and the sun cult: To bring this paper to a head it remains to suggest the way by which the hair has become not only a seat of life but also the residence of divinity. The solution occurs by reference to the sun cult and the association therewith of imitative magic. This is suggested rather pointedly in the frequency with which solar symbols are introduced in connection with hair-cult customs.

We have, for instance, reference, already given, to the Japanese Sun Goddess unbinding her "august hair" and twisting it again into "august bunches." We have it again in the Bible story of Samson, "the Sunny one," whose mighty locks can hardly be disassociated from solar symbolism. We have it in many of the stories of the horses, almost uniformly symbols of the sun. For example, we take the Mongol myth of "Yarente Khan and his son Sokto" (JER. CURTIN, *Journeys in Southern Siberia*, p. 262) in which the magic stallion has a hair on the end of his tail from which three other hairs grow. "Take the hair" the hero is advised, "and put it under thy arm. It has magic power in it" and the story goes on to describe the perils through which the hair enables the hero to pass. In another myth, that of Alamadjin (*op. cit.*, p. 272), we are introduced to a similar horse: "The horse lay down and rolled; some of his hair fell out, as much in bulk as a big stack of hay. 'If enemies come' said he, 'get under the hair and hide there, ye will be safe from them. If I am well, the hair will last many years. If I am lost, it will vanish. If ye grieve for me, smell the hair and ye will be cheerful'." May not this have been the significance of the hair of Solomon's horsemen, with its golden dust, as described by Josephus (*Ant.* VIII vii 3): "They had also very long heads of hair, so that their heads sparkled with the reflections of the sun-beams from the gold"? The language, too, of the *Rigveda* (I 162, 163) respecting the Açvamedha, or great Horse-Sacrifice, plainly a solar rite,

may here be referred to. The sun-horse, of which the sacrificial victim was the earthly representative, is described: "His mane is of gold (*hiranyasringa*)" and it is thus addressed: "Thy body, horse, is made for motion: thy mind is rapid as the wind: the hairs of thy mane are tossed in manifold directions; and spread beautiful in the forests." That is, the horse is identified with Agni, which flames on earth, consuming the forests, as Surya flames in heaven.

The golden hair of Nisus, upon which his life depended, and the wonderful hair of the Irish hero, Cuchulain, doubtless belong to the same category.

It seems probable that hair, especially if made to resemble the rays of the sun, by the application of gold-dust, or in other ways, might be regarded very definitely as a sun charm, productive of good weather, and that for this reason the hair of the ruler of a country, or the hair of a priest, was of special value. This would explain also, not only the sacredness of such things as combs, but, in the case of Japan, of the *kaş* and *mino*, the straw hats and capes which were used as talismans to obtain good weather, as though the imitation of hair had itself affinity with the solar rays.

One of the best sources for hints of the above kind is in the Fairy Tales which so often contain ancient wisdom under pretence of providing amusement for children. One such seems to me especially suggestive. It is the Slav story by ALEX CHODSKO entitled "The Three Golden Hairs of Old Man Vsévéde." It tells how a certain king sends the hero to get three golden hairs from Dède Vsévéde, with the hope of getting rid of the young man who desires to marry the king's daughter. By the help of an old woman, one of the Fates, the hairs are obtained, and incidentally lead to the recovery of an apple tree which has not borne fruit for twenty years, and other marvels. As though to leave no doubt as to the significance of the story, the old woman exclaims: "Dède Vsévéde indeed! Why, I am his mother; it is the shining sun himself. He is a child at morning time, a grown man at mid-day, a decrepit old man, looking as if he had lived a hundred years, at eventide. But I will see that you have the three hairs from his head; I am not your god-mother for nothing."

Hair and sympathetic magic: Similar instances of "sun-lock" stories might be given, but this article has already grown to too

great length. In what we call sympathetic magic there is not only the feeling expressed that man is a working partner with God in keeping the processes of nature at work, but there is also implicit the deeper philosophy that the macrocosm of the universe has in the microcosm of the individual something correspondent with itself. There is a relation between the God Transcendent Who governs through the infinite machine we call Nature and the God Immanent Who works through the functions of man's body, and mind, and spirit. We are enabled to get a glimpse of that "Higher Pantheism" in which God is both transcendent and immanent. A Japanese poet writes:

"So may I grow as pines upon her heights,
And flow with all her rivers to the sea,
And fall on her as dew in summer nights,
And guard and serve her through eternity."

Thus everything a man owns, or touches, or is, is linked with something which he can only touch indirectly or by imitative and sympathetic effort. It is east then for the Universe to be conceived of as a gigantic Body, like that of the Chinese P'an-kou, in which like corresponds to like. And what could be more natural than that the "hairs of Vishnu" (the Sun-god of the Indian Trimurti) should have their avatars in the hairs of the human head? If this be true, the source of life is seen to have care for its own, whether in the hair of the head or in the rays of the shining sun. Berenice, mourning her locks stolen from her in the Temple of Venus, is consoled, knowing them uplifted to shine amid the constellations of the sky. Moreover, since life is one, the mysticism of WILLIAM BLAKE will easily find its justification, in ages far removed from those of primitive religion. There is, after all, no lack of relation between the insignificant hair upon the human head and the Infinite God, since one has already learned

"To see a world in a grain of sand,
And a heaven in a wild flower;
Hold infinity in the palm of your hand,
And eternity in an hour."

NOCHMALS ZUM NEUNZEHNTEM PSALM

Von ROBERT EISLER, Paris

Als verspätete Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag¹ legte der Verfasser dem verehrten Lehrer, väterlichen Freund und Trauzeugen einen Ergänzungs- und Deutungsversuch des schönsten Liedes im ganzen Psalter vor, in dem er seit vielen Jahren² einen althebräischen Jubelgesang auf die Hochzeit Jahves mit der Sonne erkannt zu haben glaubte. Die außerordentliche Wichtigkeit der mit dieser kleinen Arbeit angeschnittenen Fragen — ob tatsächlich Psalmen davidischer Zeit in Bruchstücken der Salomonischen Lieder-sammlung, des *sefer-haš-šir*, erhalten sind, aus denen Rückschlüsse von grundlegender Wichtigkeit auf die Überreste altsemitischer Astralkulte in der Religion der altisraelitischen Königszeit gezogen werden könnten — mag es rechtfertigen, wenn er nun zum 70. Jahresfest des gefeierten Altmeisters keine bessere Gabe darzubringen weiß, als einige Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen des damals vermutungsweise wiederhergestellten Wortlautes von Psalm 19₂ 7. Sie sollen zugleich den Bedenken und sehr beachtenswerten Einwänden Rechnung tragen, die brieflich von MARTIN BUBER, FELIX PERLES, HUGO GRESSMANN³ und RUDOLF KITTEL,⁴ vor allem aber öffentlich in einem außerordentlich dankenswerten und ausführ-

¹ Orientalist. Studien, Fritz Hommel z. 60. Geburtstag gewidmet, II. B. MVAG 1917, XXII (1918).

² Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt, München 1910, S. 596—603.

³ 22. Januar 1919: „ich war eine Zeitlang sogar überzeugt, daß Sie recht hätten, aber ...“

⁴ Nach frdl. brieflichen Mitteilungen hatte KITTEL schon vor Erscheinen meines Aufsatzes im Handexemplar seines Psalmenkommentars von 1914 aus v. SCHROEDER, Reden und Aufsätze, 1913, 360 zu Ps. 19 vermerkt, daß an den altarischen Sonnenwendfesten (cf. *tekuphato!* v. 7b, auch der Mond hat seine Kulminations- und Wendepunkte im Jahr! Siehe u. S. 41 Anm. 80. Steht die Sonne hoch, so steht der Mond niedrig!) Lieder von der Hochzeitsfeier der jungen Sonne mit dem Mond, mit Morgen- und Abendstern oder dem Himmelsgott gesungen wurden. KITTEL hat also unabhängig von mir die „hochzeitlichen“ Elemente in dem Astralhymnus Ps. 19 bemerkt.

lichen Aufsatz von KARL BUDDE⁵ erhoben worden sind, in dem dieser den Verfasser ausdrücklich aufgefordert hatte, sich über die kosmologische Deutung des Psalms nochmals eingehend auszusprechen.⁶

Dieser Einladung zu folgen ist eine um so angenehmere Pflicht, als der Schreiber dieser Zeilen BUDDE in mehreren Hauptpunkten rückhaltlos recht geben kann, ohne dadurch seine eigenen Aufstellungen in den wesentlichen Ergebnissen erschüttert zu sehen.

BUDDE hatte der fraglichen Abhandlung in seiner über Verdienst freundlichen Beurteilung „selten gründliche Arbeit“, „gediegene Sachkenntnis“, „umfassende Beherrschung einer weitverzweigten Literatur“, „völlige und eingehende Berücksichtigung scheinbar auch der letzten abweichenden Möglichkeit“, „restlose Aufarbeitung des gesamten Stoffes“ zugebilligt und daran die Frage geknüpft, wie „dennoch dieses schlechthin unmögliche Ergebnis“ zustande kommen konnte: ein Lied von der Hochzeit Jahves, des Gottes, für den eine geschlechtliche Ergänzung im ganzen Alten Testament auch nicht ein einziges Mal angedeutet wird. Wie lange sollte das zurückliegen hinter der Zeit, wo Jahve Israel zu eigen wurde, und wie sollte ein solches Fossil gerade im Psalter gehütet worden sein?

Hier muß nun BUDDE in der Tat vollkommen zugegeben werden, daß der Name Jahves in der Überschrift wie im Zusammenhang der fraglichen Abhandlung eitel genannt worden ist, und daß Ps. 19 auch in der vorgeschlagenen Ergänzung als Zeugnis für einen althebräischen Mythos von der Hochzeit Jahves nicht in Betracht kommen kann.

Ich hatte übersehen, daß der Halbvers **יְהוָה אָמַר לִשְׁכֵּן בְּעֶרְפֶּל** aus 1 Kön. 12b, den ich nach wie vor in die anerkanntermaßen im Ps. 19 vorhandene Lücke einfügen zu dürfen glaube, im Zusammenhang einer Quelle⁷ überliefert ist, die regelmäßig den Gottesnamen **יְהוָה** gebraucht. Da nun die Septuagintaversion deutlich erkennen läßt, daß gerade an dem Gottesnamen bei der Verflechtung der alten Einzelquellen viel mehr ausgeglichen worden ist, als die älteren Quellenkritiker wahr haben wollten, so hätte von vornherein mit der Möglichkeit gerechnet werden müssen, daß der

⁵ Ps. 19²⁻⁷. Jahves Hochzeit mit der Sonne? Or. Lit.-Zeit. 1919, 257—266.

⁶ a. a. O., Sp. 259, Z. 28.

⁷ Vgl. dazu MVAG XXII 58 f.

Gottesname יהוה in dem entscheidenden Versbruchstück des Königsbuches erst durch eine redaktionelle Überarbeitung nach der Einfügung dieser ursprünglichen Randbemerkung⁸ in den Text einer jahvistischen Quelle an die Stelle des archaischen, im Eingangsvers Ps. 19₂ benützten Gottesnamens אל getreten sein konnte, umgekehrt wie im zweiten und dritten Buch des Psalters⁹ für יהוה regelmäßig אלהים verbessert worden ist.¹⁰ Der abwechselnde Gebrauch von אל und יהוה in meiner Wiederherstellung des 19. Psalms schien mir damals gerechtfertigt durch den ganz entsprechenden Wechsel von יהוה und אלהים in anderen Psalmen (z. B. 84) und ist auch von keinem Kritiker beanstandet worden. Ich hätte jedoch selber eben an der von BUDE so richtig hervorgehobenen Unvereinbarkeit eines *ἱερός γάμος*-Mythus mit allen sonstigen Überlieferungen der prophetischen Jahvereligion erkennen können und sollen, daß der von mir ergänzte Psalm ursprünglich ein reiner El-Hymnus gewesen sein muß, der mit dem Jahve von Sinai kaum etwas zu tun haben konnte.

Mit O. SCHROEDER¹¹ — der Ps. 19₁₋₇ einen „Sonnenhymnus“ nennt,¹² welcher erst bei der Aufnahme dieses Liedes in den Psalter Israels durch Überarbeitung dem Herrn und Schöpfer der Sonnenscheibe zugeeignet worden sei — hätte ich aufs stärkste betonen sollen, daß — im Gegensatz zu dem späten, wenn auch von vornherein als Fortsetzung zur ersten Hälfte¹³ gedachten jahvistischen Abgesang — v. 2—7 „durchaus der El-Religion angehört“.

Nur daß ich unter „El-Religion“ nicht mit SCHROEDER ein astral-theologisches System¹⁴ kananäischer Urzeit verstehe, sondern viel-

⁸ Vgl. die Quellscheidung MVAG XXII 60_r.

⁹ Ich erinnere besonders an das durch diese Korrektur entstandene אל אלהים יהוה in Ps. 50_r.

¹⁰ ... אל אמר klingt auch rhythmisch-melodisch viel besser als יהוה אמר. Freilich ist dabei zu berücksichtigen, daß damals wohl noch eine vokalische Endung nach אל gesprochen wurde.

¹¹ ZATW XXXIV 69.

¹² Ebenso GUNKEL, *Ausgewählte Psalmen* 27; *Psalmen* 4, Göttingen 1926, 75 und GRESSMANN, *Paläst. Erdgeruch* 93.

¹³ Siehe SCHROEDERS Beobachtung a. a. O., S. 70 über אין נסתר v. 7 b und נסתרות v. 13.

¹⁴ In Kana'an scheint nach den Ortsnamen חֲדָשָׁה, dem Femininum zu hebr. חֹדֶשׁ „Neumond“ (L. B. PATON, *Enc. Rel. Eth.*, vol. III, p. 180 a, § 13, 2) — wozu babil. *ḥadaššatu* „Brautschaft“ (REISNER, *Hymn.*, S. 145, VIII) zu vergleichen wäre —, und *Bit-arḫa* („Haus der Wanderin“), Amarnabriefe, KNUDTZ. 83₂₉, der Mond weiblich (לְבָנָה!) gewesen zu sein (über die ägäisch-kleinasiatische Herkunft dieser Vor-

mehr gerade den altarabischen oder meinetwegen altaramäischen¹⁵ Wüstenkult der Habiru-Stämme,¹⁶ den man sich nach Anleitung der thamudenischen und safathenischen Inschriften¹⁷ vorzustellen hat, in denen der Mondgott (*Sin*, *Warah*, *Šahar*) einfach als *Il* (אל), die göttliche Gattin (אלה, אלהת oder האלה) aber regelmäßig mit „Šams“ bezeichnet wird, und in dem dieses alt-, um nicht zu sagen ursemitische Götterpaar eine fast ausschließliche Verehrung genießt.

Damit entfällt aber von vornherein der religionsgeschichtliche Anstoß, der BUDDE veranlaßt hat, die vorgeschlagene Textergänzung als ein „schlechthin unmögliches Ergebnis“ zu bezeichnen und eine andere Erklärung des Tatbestandes zu versuchen: es handelt sich in dem fraglichen Lied in der Tat gar nicht um den einzig einzigen Gott des prophetischen Monotheismus, neben

stellung s. A. CUNY, Rev. Études Anc. XII, 1910, 163), wie denn SCHROEDER a. a. O. für שמש in Ps. 19_{5b} אל שמש lesen und den Sonnengott sich selbst „sein Zelt“ (αὐτοῦ σκηνή, אהלו) erbauen läßt, aus dem er dann כהן heraustritt. Wenn man diese Änderung annimmt und ברה im u. S. 34 f. angegebenen Sinn erklärt, ergibt sich ein wohl zusammenhängender Text, in dem höchstens zwischen v. 5 c und 6 noch eine Erwähnung der bräutlichen לבה oder הרה vermißt werden könnte. Diese Möglichkeit hätte ich MVAG XXII 30 gewiß erwähnt, wenn mir nicht — ich stand damals im Felde — SCHROEDERS Aufsatz entgangen wäre. Ich würde diese Ergänzung immer noch vorziehen der von BUDDE, OLZ 1919, Sp. 265 vorgeschlagenen, die den Psalm als Art Tagreveille- oder Wecklied erklärt (ähnlich übrigens schon Goethe im „Faust“ — nach Herder?: „tönend wird für Geistesohren schon der neue Tag geboren, welch Getöse bringt das Licht, Unerhörtes hört sich nicht!“), da der Psalm kultisch m. W. nie wie die joſer 'or-Benediktion als täglicher Morgengruß benützt worden ist, sondern stets der Psalm der Sabbathe und מועדים (= „Festtage“, wörtl. σάββατοι; cf. אהל מועד = tent of tryst = Zelt des Stelldicheins) in der altengl. Version = Zelt des σάββατος; hiezu religionsgesch. Parallelen in großer Zahl anderswo) gewesen ist, wobei ich den Sabbat mit JASTROW u. a. als Fest der „Mondruhe“ auffasse (vgl. Is. 40₂₂: „der die Himmel ausspannt und ausbreitet wie ein Zelt לִשְׁכַּת, um zu ruhen“). Nach Sap. Sal. 9₈ ist ja der Tempel — מכוֹן לְשִׁבְחָךְ im Weihepsalm Salomonis! — wie Exod. 25₉ P. das 'ohel mo'ed ein οἶκος θεοῦ ἀγίας ἢ προσευχῆς (scil. „o Gott!“) ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, der ἀληθινὴ ἀγαθή und des ἁγίου κοσμοκτόνου (Hebr. 8₃), d. h. jenes Tempels, den Gott nach Mark. 14₅₈ „in drei Tagen“, d. h. in den Neumonds Nächten, aufbaut.

¹⁵ Vgl. hiezu aram. הַיָּה in v. 5! Über das altaramäische Element in der hebräischen Mischsprache ist jetzt BAUER-LEANDER, Hist. Gramm. d. hebr. Spr., Halle a. S. 1922, S. 23 ff., zu vergleichen.

¹⁶ Beachte die wichtige Mitteilung E. FORRERS ZDMG 1922, 251₂, daß die in den Boghazköj-Texten genannten *Habiri*-Götter (AN-MEŠ *Ha-bi-reš*) eine Göttergruppe sein müssen, da AN-MEŠ in diesen Urkunden niemals als *pluralis maiest.* für einen Gott steht.

¹⁷ Belege bei NIELSEN, MVAG XXI 252 ff. Z. 5 über den Naturmythus der Hochzeit des אלה mit der שמש.

dem für eine zweite Gottheit, nun gar astralen Wesens, allerdings kein Platz ist, sondern um den ἱερός γάμος des altheidnisch-ursemitischen 'El, 'Il oder 'Ila, der ja auch auf altarabischen Inschriften (o. S. 24₁₇) mit der Sonnengöttin Šams oder 'Ilat gepaart erscheint, allerdings „ein Fossil“, aber eines, das nach den Ergebnissen meiner Untersuchungen durchaus nicht „im Psalter gehütet“, sondern vielmehr im Psalter sehr früh sorgfältig getilgt worden ist. Etwas später — nämlich erst nach der Abzweigung des ägyptischen Handschriftenstammes, auf den die Septuaginta zurückgeht, durch die Galuth des Jeremias (43₇) 586 v. Chr. — ist die anstößige Stelle auch im Königsbuch gestrichen worden. In beiden Fällen kann an zufällige Lücken — etwa durch Wurmfraß in einer Musterhandschrift — nach der ganzen Sachlage nicht gedacht werden. Wenn in einem Lied von so ausgedehntem gottesdienstlichen Gebrauch, das jeder Jude in- und auswendig gewußt haben muß, ein Halbvers fehlt — und darüber sind sich doch alle einig —, so kann es sich nur um eine absichtliche Ströichung gehandelt haben, wie ich eine solche z. B. auch in der Lücke Jesaia's 28_{16b}¹⁸ nachzuweisen in der Lage bin. Die Tatsache, daß das hebräische Vorbild von ἡλίον ἐγγώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ im masoretischen Urtext gestrichen worden ist, beweist, daß die Worte in der Zeit nach Jeremias einem empfindlicheren religiösen Bewußtsein anstößig erschienen. Man darf sie also nicht mit BUDDE,¹⁹ WELLHAUSEN und

¹⁸ Hier ist das bisher unidentifizierte Schriftwort des Ev. Joh. 7₃₈ einzufügen.

¹⁹ Seinen Verbesserungsvorschlag zu WELLHAUSEN'S Rückübersetzung הכין für ἐγγώρισεν muß ich als sehr scharfsinnig anerkennen. Es ist der erste Versuch, die Rückübersetzung dieses Wortes nicht nur mit der Erklärung der Lukianischen Variante ἕστηκεν zu verknüpfen, sondern auch einigermaßen auf den Sprachgebrauch der LXX Rücksicht zu nehmen. Aber durch diesen Fortschritt über WELLHAUSEN'S und ŠANDAS Konjekturen hinaus wird doch meine (und KLOSTERMANN'S) Rückübersetzung von γωρίζειν noch nicht im entferntesten „irrig“ (BUDDE, a. a. O., Sp. 264₁). Immer noch bleibt כר = γωρίζειν bei den LXX ein einziges Mal, das Hiphil הכר für dieses Wort aber überhaupt gar nicht bezeugt, gegenüber der ganz gewöhnlichen Gleichung von γωρίζειν und ידע; immer noch läßt sich beweisen, daß Formen von ידע und ידע von den LXX tatsächlich verwechselt worden sind — F. PERLES verweist mich freundlichst auf Amos 3₃ — und daß daher ein Korrektor leicht glauben konnte, auch hier sei ein in ידע verlesenes ידע wiederherzustellen, während eine Verlesung oder Verschreibung von הכין in הכן oder הכר gewiß denkbar, aber nirgends nachgewiesen ist. Immer noch steht meine Rückübersetzung im Zusammenhang einer weit ausgreifenden, von BUDDE selbst als sorgfältig begründet anerkannten literar- und religionsgeschichtlichen Erklärung, während die drei anderen Vorschläge bloße Einfälle, richtige „Konjekturen“ alten Stils sind und bloß den Zufall und Schreibfehlerteufel als *deus ex machina* ein-

ŠANDA so zurückübersetzen, daß etwas dogmatisch ganz Unbedenkliches herauskommt, wenn anders man nicht für die Entstehung der entsprechenden Lücke im Urtext auf jede Erklärung verzichten oder gar den ägyptischen Juden eine ganz unverständliche und grundlose Einfügung in den Urtext zuschieben will.

Natürlich bleibt es religionsgeschichtlich höchst bemerkenswert, daß David — dem das Lied *ex hypothesi* nicht nur im jetzigen Psalter, sondern schon im Salomonischen Liederbuch, dem *sefer-haš-šir*, zugeschrieben war — diesen Hymnus unbedenklich in die Liturgie des Jahvekultes eingeführt, ein späterer Schreiber beim Abschreiben sogar den Namen אל geradezu durch יהוה ersetzt hat.

Aber ist es denn überhaupt richtig, daß jede Spur einer weiblichen Ergänzung Jahves in unserer Überlieferung fehlt, wie BUDDE a. a. O. so eindringlich erklärt?

Ich will hier gar nicht von außerbiblischen, aber darum nicht weniger jüdischen (bzw. altaramäischen) Zeugnissen sprechen, nicht von der keineswegs auf die Kabbalisten²⁰ beschränkten Vorstellung einer *matrona* oder *šekhina*²¹ Gottes, nicht von der philonischen Allegorie einer Vermählung Gottes mit der *Σοφία* (cf. Sap. Sal. 8, 9f.), die ihm den Λόγος und Κόσμος gebiert; auch nicht

führen. Endlich hat BUDDE mit keinem Wort das S. 45₂ angeführte Zeugnis des Midraš Tehillin berücksichtigt, der ganz offensichtlich die zwei Gedanken τῷ ἁλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ und τὸν ἥλιον ἔστηκεν ἐν οὐρανῷ (בשמים) nebeneinander im Ps. 19 gelesen hat, wenn der Aggadist in seiner Erläuterung von Ps. 19, erklärt, Gott habe — um die Glut der Sonne zu mildern — einen כרח = νάρθηξ, d. h. einen Kasten um sie gebaut und sie in den zweiten oberen Himmel gestellt! (also *šamajim* als Dual gefaßt!). Ganz abgesehen davon, ob mit WELLHAUSEN und BUDDE die Lukianische Lesart „ἔστηκεν“ oder die der LXX-κοινή „ἐγνώρισεν“ als entsprechend der *hebraica veritas* betrachtet wird; abgesehen davon, ob in dem verlorenen Halbvers das Verbum ידן oder ידן gestanden hat, bezeugt dieser Midraš m. E., daß die hebräischen Vorbilder von τῷ ἁλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκήνωμα αὐτοῦ und ἥλιον ^{ἔστηκεν} ^{ἐγνώρισεν} ἐν οὐρανῷ einmal im Ps. 19 nebeneinander gestanden haben. *Quod erat in primis demonstrandum!*

²⁰ Zu dem MVAG XXII 24 Angeführten vergleiche noch S. RUBIN, Kabbala und Heidentum, Wien 1893, S. 51 u. S. 88**, über den סוד הזיווג (*sod hazivug*), das „Mysterium der Vereinigung“: über Sonne und Mond als Ehepaar, *malka'* und *mathronitha* als göttliches Ehepaar besonders das Zitat aus Rabbenu Bachja zum Abschnitt וישב zum Vers *jehi 'or vajehi 'or*. S. 100 über das *coniugium deorum* Zohar fol. 296 b, BÄHR, Symbolik d. mosaischen Kultes I 485. Bei MOSE CORDOVERO, *pardes VIII* 19, werden die zwei sefiroth *malkhuth* und *thipheret* „Bräutigam“ und „Braut“ (*hathan* und *kallah*), „Mann“ und „Frau“ genannt.

²¹ Belege aus Mischna und Talmud bei LEVY, Nhb. Wb. 4, 554 a. Christliches über die *matrona* MVAG XXII 29₃. Dazu Philon, de ebriet. 244 C; Leg. allegor. 1096 B u. ö.

von dem keilschriftlich erhaltenen westsemitischen Personennamen der Hammurabbizeit *Aširat-Jawe*,²² und nicht von der עֲנַת בַּחֲאֵל,²³ der die Juden oder Samaritaner von Elefantine noch zur Perserzeit zugleich mit einer Spende für יְהוָה Opfer darbringen.²⁴ Aber wo bleibt denn die im Alten Testament selbst bezeugte „Himmelskönigin“ (**malkat haššamajim* = LXX βασιλίσσα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, vulg. *regina coeli*), für die die von Jeremias 7₁₆₋₂₀, 44₁₅₋₃₀ dafür gegeißelten Weiber von Jerusalem nach altem, erst kürzlich abgekommenem Brauch wieder Bildkuchen [*kawanim*; vgl. „χαβῶνες· στηθία ὀπτῶμενα ὑπὸ ἀλεύρου“ Hesych; also wohl Brötchen von der Gestalt weiblicher Brüste] buken? Wo bleibt die „Ašerah“ im Tempel von Jerusalem — also eine richtige *Aširat-Jawe* (s. o. Anm. 22) und σύνθετος des Gottes —, für die die Tempeldirnen von Jerusalem, doch wohl in Nachahmung jener ἀχειροποιήτος ἀληθινή σκηνή der Himmelsbraut,²⁵ nach 2 Kön. 23, bis zur Zeit des Königs Josias „Zelte (בָּתִּים) weben“?

Ohne Frage muß eine für Jahve veranstaltete Hochzeitsfeier mit einer noch so abstrakt gedachten Göttin vom Standpunkt des prophetischen Monotheismus als polytheistische Abgötterei erschienen sein. Aber der naiven, volkstümlichen Monolatrie des Stammesgottes in den althergebrachten Formen der ursemitischen Astralreligion mußte es eben so natürlich erscheinen, dem Gott im Zelt ein Beilager zu rüsten, wie ihm den Tisch mit Brot und Opferspeise zu decken. Freilich steht geschrieben (Ps. 51₃₁): „esse ich etwa das Fleisch von Stieren, trinke ich das Blut von Böcken? opfert Gott Dank!“ Trotzdem aber mußte erst der Tempel auf Sion zerstört werden, damit das reine Dankopfer der Lippen die

²² Vorderasiat. Schriftdenkm., Berlin, VII, 157, 7 geschrieben Ja-Pl. Über den Wert *we* des Zeichens Pl s. *Journ. Am. Or. Soc.* 31, 43 ff. Ich weiß natürlich, daß man den Bestandteil „Ja-we“ in dieser Namensgruppe zu leugnen versucht hat (HEHN, *Bibl. u. bab. Gottesidee* 233); aber seit ich mir über die appellativische Bedeutung von יְהוָה klar geworden bin (s. einstweilen MVAG XXII 36₁), sehe ich gar keinen Grund mehr, an einem Jahve- (d. h. Meteor-) Kult außerisraelitischer Stämme zu zweifeln.

²³ = *responsum Domus Dei* „Bescheid des heiligen Hauses“ = akkad. „Tašmetum“ (= „Orakel“, „Erhörung“), die die *kallat* (Braut) des Gottes *Nabu* ist. Ebenso ist die עֲנַת בַּחֲאֵל als eine Pythia des semitischen Apollon aufzufassen.

²⁴ Bestritten von EPSTEIN, ZATW XXXII 141; s. dagegen C. VAN GELDERN, OLZ XV, 1912, 344₁.

²⁵ „Ašratum kallat šamē“, die „Himmelsbraut“, heißt die durch ihre Verbindung mit dem Gott *Amurru* (JENSEN, ZA 11, 304 f.) als amoritisch gekennzeichnete *Ašerah*, in der Weiheinschrift des Gaufürsten Iturašdu für das Leben Hammurabbis (WINCKLER, MVAG 1913, 4, K VIII, S. 95).

alten Blutopfer verdrängen konnte. Semitischer Volksglaube, der den Gott speisen zu müssen glaubte, hielt auch die Darbringung einer *kallatu* (o. S. 27₂₃) oder *enitu* für ein dem Gott wohlgefälliges Opfer, und in der Tat sind ja bis zur Kultusreform des Josias (2 Kön. 23₇) die *Qedeshot* oder Hierodulen im Tempelbezirk Jahves sicher bezeugt.

Derartige Riten scheinen in der Tat Gemeingut aller Semiten gewesen zu sein. Man erinnert sich an die vielbesprochene Stelle, wo Herodot (I 181) als Augenzeuge den großen siebenstufigen Tempelturm des Bel in Babylonien beschreibt und seine Schilderung mit folgenden Worten abschließt: „und in dem obersten Stockwerk ist eine geräumige Cella (*ναός*), und in der Cella steht ein großes, schön aufgerüstetes Bett und daneben steht ein goldener Tisch. Aber kein Bild ist darin aufgerichtet, auch übernachtet kein Mensch allda, ausgenommen etwa ein inländisches Weib, das sich der Gott selbst von allen auserkoren,²⁶ wie die Chaldäer erzählen, die da sind die Priester desselben Gottes. Diese Leute erzählen auch — ich glaube es aber nicht! —, der Gott komme zuweilen in den Tempel und schlafe auf dem Bette, gerade wie die Ägypter von Theben erzählen, denn auch allda schläft ein Weib im Tempel des thebäischen Zeus, und diese beiden Weiber sollen nie mit einem Manne Gemeinschaft haben.“

Damit sind eine Reihe von Stellen zu vergleichen, die schon von F. HOMMEL²⁷ zusammengestellt worden sind. Zunächst erwähnt Tiglatpileser (I) einen Tempel der Götter Anu und Hadad in Assur, der *bit hamri* „Haus des Bräutigams“ (*hamru* = *hamiru*, *hajiru* „Bräutigam“) genannt wird.²⁸ Nach einem gleichnamigen Heiligtum muß auch die babylonisch-elamitische Grenzstadt *Bit hajiri*²⁹ genannt sein, während das „Tor des göttlichen Bräutigams“ (*bab ilu Hamri*) in Arbela sich wohl auf den Einzug des göttlichen Bräutigams der Ištar von Arbela beziehen wird, und der Name der bekannten babylonischen Stadt *E-kallati* = „Haus der Braut“ die alte, matriarchale Auffassung von dem der Braut ge-

²⁶ Also eine sog. *enitu* oder Gottesbraut! Die *ἡλείνη* des Gottes heißt babylonisch *šiknu* (s. JENSEN, KB VI 333 vgl. 250), also genau entsprechend dem o. Anm. 21 angeführten hebr. *sekhina*.

²⁷ Grundriß der Geographie und Geschichte des Alten Orients, II. Teil, 402 und 410.

²⁸ Vgl. MVAG XXII 28₂, 29 über das Hochzeitshaus als Eigentum des Bräutigams.

²⁹ GGAO 410₃.

hörigen Hochzeitshaus oder -zelt bezeugt; er wird wohl auf ein Heiligtum der Göttin *E-gi-a* = *kallatu*, der „Braut“ schlechthin, d. h. der Gattin des Gottes Nebo, *Tašmetum* (vgl. o. S. 27₂₃), oder auf einen Tempel der häufig *kallatu* genannten A-A, der Gemahlin des „Šamaš“,³⁰ zurückweisen. Wenn bei dem von jeher hauptsächlich eine Götterhochzeit — zuerst des *Ningirsu* und der *Bau* (*Ninib* und *Gula*), später des Marduk und der Šarpanitum — darstellenden babylonischen *ZAG-MUG* (*akitu*)³¹ ein eigenes „Neujahrsfesthaus der Steppe“, also „Neujahrsfestzelt“ erbaut wird, so kann wohl kaum bezweifelt werden, daß dieses geradezu als „Hochzeitszelt“ gedient hat.

Endlich ist eine wichtige hiehergehörige Nachricht über das uralte Mondheiligtum von Harran in den Auszügen erhalten, die En-nedim im Fihrist³² aus dem Kalender der standhaft den Islam ablehnenden und in der bodenständigen Astralreligion verharrenden sog. Šabier von Harran anführt: er sagt dort „am 4. Kānun (= Dezember) schlagen sie ein gewölbtes Zelt auf, das sie *El Chidr* (= חדר = Brautgemach³³) nennen, für *Ba'alti*; diese ist die Venus, die Göttin *Barḳajah*,³⁴ die „Funkelnde“,³⁵ und sie behängen es mit verschiedenen Baumfrüchten, wohlriechenden Kräutern, trockenen roten Rosen, Zitronen u. dgl.“³⁶ Als Bräutigam ist in Harran-Karrhae = Καρχαίρη (von *kamar* = Mond) natürlich niemand anderer als der dort noch in der Römerzeit durch Münzen bezeugte *Deus Lunus* = *ilu Sin*³⁷ anzunehmen.

³⁰ ZIMMERN, KAT³ 368, 432₃; GUNKEL, Ausgew. Ps.² 28.

³¹ ZIMMERN, Ber. d. k. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., 58. Band, S. 144.

³² Siehe CHWOLSON, Die Šabier II 33. Die Quelle stammt aus dem Jahre 987 n. Chr.

³³ Diesem חדר der בעלתי in Harran ist als Gegenstück die Nennung einer בעלת־חדר auf einer Inschrift von Karthago CIS I 177 an die Seite zu stellen. Dazu vgl. VALERIUS MAX. I. II. C. VI: „*Sicca* (= *sükkah*, mit Umlaut wie heute in poln. Aussprache) *est fanum Veneris in quod se matronae conferebant atque inde procedentes ad quaestum dotis* (wie die heutigen Ouled Nail!) *corporis iniuria contrahebant.*“

³⁴ Vgl. j. Joma III 1, 40 b; Joma 28 a b; j. R. haš. II Anf. 57 d, *barḳai* = „der Morgenstern“ (LEVY, Nhb. Wb. I 270 b).

³⁵ Man beachte (zu MVAG XXII 27), daß hier also das Zelt noch für die Braut aufgestellt wird.

³⁶ Vgl. Weltenmantel S. 598 Abb. 74 das fruchtbehängte Brautzelt der Juden.

³⁷ Aus dem Festtag wird man wohl zu entnehmen haben, daß die Zählung der Monatstage mit den drei dunkeln Neumondsnächten begann, so daß der vierte Tag im Monat durch das Auftauchen der Neulichtsichel eingeleitet wurde. Die Hochzeit des Nebo und der Tašmetum wird am 4. Ijar gefeiert (HARPER, letters Nr. 113).

Nur ein Tempel, der im alten Ur die Stelle dieses Hochzeitzeltes der Harranischen Belit vertrat, kann gemeint sein, wenn Nabunaid sich auf dem Backstein I, Rawl. 68, Nr. 7 in einem ganz charakteristischen Ausdruck berühmt, er habe „*Bit-gipari*“, ³⁸ den Tempel der Herrin der Götter (*Belit-ilani*), der sich innerhalb von Ur befindet, für den Gott Sin erbaut“, da sonst einfach gesagt worden wäre, „für Belit und Sin“ sei der Tempel erbaut worden, bzw. der König habe den Tempel der Belit und des Sin erbaut: niemand kann nach dem MVAG XXII 27 Bemerkten übersehen, daß hier der König sagen will, er habe „für Sin“ (= im Namen Sins oder für Sins Hochzeit) das der göttlichen Braut gehörige, für sie eigentlich vom Bräutigam zu errichtende *bit-gipari* hergestellt.

Womöglich noch lehrreicher als diese ostsemitischen Parallelen ist aber die Tatsache, daß die Inschriften der Minaer — von denen EUTING bekanntlich eine Reihe gerade in Midian, dem überlieferten Ursprungsland des mosaischen Jahvekultes, gesammelt hat — ein im Kult der *Atirat*, der Gemahlin des „liebenden Mondgottes“ (*Waddum Šaḥran*) gebrauchtes *maḥtan* (von *ḥatan* = „Bräutigam“) *malikan* „Vermählungshaus des Gott-Königs“ ³⁹ erwähnen. ⁴⁰ Endlich ist hier die jährlich erneuerte Bekleidung der Kaaba von Mekka mit einem vom Khalifen in Konstantinopel übersandten Umhang — der sog. *kiswah* ⁴¹ — zu vergleichen, in der WELLHAUSEN

³⁸ *giparu*, irgend etwas Schattig-Dunkles, Rohrpfanzung?, Hain? o. dgl. Ein Haus der 7 *giparu*-Stauden, bzw. Bäume (cf. עֵץ-גִּפְרִי I Mos. 6₁₄, HALEVY und HOMMEL bei HASTINGS, Dict. Bibl. I 214 b) heißt der Stufenturm von Ezech. 2, Rawl. 50, col. 7/8, Z. 20 u. col. 1/2, Z. 19, GGGAO, 363. *Bit-gipari* ist also ein „Baumhaus“, vielleicht ähnlich wie das *bit-ḥilani* oder das Libanonwaldhaus mit Säulen aus einer köstlichen Holzart (oder aus Bambusrohr? o. dgl.) oder ein Bau mit „hängenden Gärten“ (oder bloß mit stilisierten Pflanzensäulen?). Über Bäumen erbaute Zelte und Häuser s. EISLER, Weltenmantel, S. 592–595 und 611. Vielleicht ist aber *bit-giparu* schlechthin die Hochzeitslaube (= „Rohrhaus“) oder Laubhütte, der immergrüne *ereš* MVAG XXII 27₃. Im Lied von der himmlischen Hochzeit in den gnostischen Thomasakten c. 6 (HENNECKE, Neutest. Apokr. I 483) sind im Brautgemach die Eingänge mit Rohr geschmückt.

³⁹ Vgl. die *malkat šamaim* und den *Milkom* der Moabiter, den *Moloch* der Kananäer.

⁴⁰ HOMMEL, GGGAO 136, Aufsätze und Abhandlungen, S. 207 f.

⁴¹ Vgl. die Zeugnisse Philologus LXVIII 118₁ und bei HUGHES, *Dictionary of Islam* s. v. *kiswah* (280 b). *Ibid.* (306) s. v. *maḥmal* findet man die Stellen über den parallelen Brauch, daß alljährlich von Kairo aus unter feierlichem Gepränge ein kostbarer Zeltbaldachin für die *Ka'aba* nach Mekka gesandt wird. Es ist klar, daß durch die politische Entwicklung des Kalifats zwei gleichbedeutende, rivalisierende Riten aus einem entstanden sind.

längst⁴² einen Überrest eines ursprünglichen Zeltes erkannt hat. In der jährlichen Erneuerung des Umhangs kommt die Zweckbestimmung des Zeltes für das besondere Fest der altarabischen Göttin *Ka'aba* — der *Ναβοῦ* der Nabataer — klar zum Ausdruck, zumal ja arabische Mystiker wie der Dichter 'Abd-er-Rahin el Buraj⁴³ in dem Vers *وعروسى مكة بالكرامات تجلى* „und die Braut von Mekka (sc. die *Ka'aba*) prangt (neu) bedeckt mit (Wunder-)zeichen“⁴⁴ die ursprüngliche Eigenart des Wallfahrtsfestes deutlich bezeugen.

Solche von Fall zu Fall, Fest um Fest für die himmlische Braut des Gottes neu hergestellte Zelte sind wohl auch gemeint, wenn die Königsbücher (II 23,) von den Hierodulen des Tempels von Jerusalem erzählen, daß sie die „Zelte für die Ašerah⁴⁵ weben“; und dem gleichen Zweck, d. h. den Zauberriten der „heiligen Hochzeit“, die die Propheten so oft als „Unzucht“ geißeln, werden dann auch die von Ezechiel 16₁₆ erwähnten, aus zusammengenähten Mänteln flüchtig errichteten Zelte auf den ländlichen Opferhöhen der *Be'alim* gedient haben.

Nichts hindert also, Ps. 19₂₋₇ als ein uraltes Festlied zu erklären, das die *Habiru* der Wüste beim Aufstellen des heiligen, für die Feier der Götterhochzeit des אלה und der שמש an den Neumondstagen zu singen pflegten, und das sinngemäß auch David bei der Aufstellung des Jahvezeltes auf der Höhe von Zion vortragen zu lassen kein Bedenken trug.

Zu diesem religionsgeschichtlich höchst altertümlichen Charakter des fraglichen El-Hymnus stimmt nun ausgezeichnet das schallanalytische⁴⁶ Untersuchungsergebnis von E. SIEVERS, der auf meine Bitte die große Güte hatte, die ergänzte Fassung von Ps. 19₂₋₇ vom rhythmisch-melodischen Standpunkt aus zu unter-

⁴² Reste arab. Heidentums², Berlin 1897, S. 73.

⁴³ Zit. bei LENORMANT, a. a. O., p. 154.

⁴⁴ Gemeint ist die gestickte Inschrift (das Glaubensbekenntnis) auf dem Umhang (die Himmelschrift auf dem Himmelszelt).

⁴⁵ Scil. die *Aširat-jawe* (o. S. 27₂₂).

⁴⁶ Über die empirischen Grundlagen dieses neuen, vielumstrittenen Verfahrens, das im Leipziger Forschungsinstitut auch schon auf die Analyse des N. T. angewendet worden ist (s. SCHANZE, Der Galaterbrief², Leipzig 1919), hat mich E. SIEVERS im Dezember 1923 in der anregendsten und eindrucksvollsten Weise persönlich belehrt, wofür ihm auch hier aufs herzlichste gedankt sei. Vgl. jetzt E. SIEVERS, H. Lietzmann und die Schallanalyse (das NT. schallanalytisch untersucht, 2. Stück, Leipzig 1924).

suchen und mit den — ebenfalls im salomonischen *sefer-haš-šîr* als davidisch überlieferten Nänien auf Saul und Jonathan (2 Sam. 1¹⁹ 27) und Abner (2 Sam. 2³³) zu vergleichen. Der Erfolg dieser Unternehmung war ebenso merkwürdig als unerwartet: während nämlich die beiden Totenklagen in ihrer „stimmlichen“ Eigenart jede für sich einheitlich und untereinander genau übereinstimmend erscheinen, somit sicher von einem und demselben Dichter, also wohl wirklich von David herrühren, ließ das auf den ersten Blick als eine in einem Schwung der Begeisterung entstandene Schöpfung erscheinende Sonnenhochzeitslied — auch schon ohne meine Einschaltung! — bei der Schallanalyse überhaupt keinen durchgehenden Stimmcharakter erkennen. Es muß also von einem Sänger oder Dichter herrühren, der — etwa in der Art der Homeriden oder der spätpäidischen *Païtanim*, deren musische Schöpfungen⁴⁷ trotzdem oft hinter der Schönheit ihrer Vorbilder nicht allzuweit zurückbleiben — die Bestandteile seiner „Komposition“ älteren, als klassisch, bzw. uralte heilig und daher für unübertrefflich geltenden Dichtungen entnommen hätte. Deshalb kann immer noch David dieser Dichter gewesen sein, der eben die Totenklage auf seine tapferen Gefährten aus eigener Inspiration geschöpft, aber in dem „Lied zur Weihe des Zeltes“ aus älteren, geheiligten Kultliedern einen kunstvollen Hymnus zusammengestellt hätte.

Inhaltlich läßt sich gegen dieses Ergebnis kaum etwas einwenden: v. 2 und 3, schallanalytisch als zusammengehörig erkennbar, können einem beliebigen, uralten, auch heidnischen Preislied auf irgendeine göttliche Schöpfungstat — Erschaffung der Erde, der Sterne, des Menschen — entnommen sein, v. 4 ist der ganz merkwürdige, fast adversativ (*'ōmēr* und *'ējn 'ōmer*, 3 a und 4 a) eingefügte Gedanke, daß die Frohbotschaft der Himmel wort- und lautlos über das Weltall hin ergeht,⁴⁸ der viel jünger sein

⁴⁷ Die Gebete des hebräischen *Mahsor*, der lateinischen und griechischen Liturgie sind ja ganz ebenso vielfach aus biblischen Versen zusammengesetzt.

⁴⁸ Vgl. hiezu jetzt F. BOLL, A. d. Offenbar. Joh., S. 193, über das nur den Auserwählten und den Seligen im Himmel vernehmbare kosmische Lied. Zu dem MVAG XXII 48₂ zu יִיִּי Gesagten vgl. noch den deutschen Ausdruck „Sternschnuppe“ (zu „schnupfen“, „schneuzen“). Nach der Kosmologie der Henochapokalypse 44₁, 43₂, cf. 59 erzeugt der Umlauf der Sterne — also קִוּם „ihre Zirkelschnur“ (v. 5 a s. MVAG XXII 70₁) — Blitze, aus Sternen entstehen Blitze, Sterne werden zu Blitzen; d. h. die alte Meteorologie unterscheidet nicht zwischen Sternschnuppen, Meteorfällen und Blitzen (s. TH. HENRI MARTIN, *La foudre*,

kann⁴⁹ und in irgendeinem Hymnus auf die schicksalsverkündenden Himmelsmächte gestanden haben mag. Für mich kam vor allem in Betracht, daß nach SIEVERS 5 a, b und c einheitlichen Stimmcharakter zeigen, man also — selbst bei einer solchen Centonen-dichtung — nicht zwischen 5 b und c einen Einschub von zwei Halbversen einfügen dürfte. Dieser einleuchtende Einwand gegen die MVAG XXII 49 vorgeschlagene Wiederherstellung erreichte mich gerade in dem Augenblick, in dem ich die auch von BUDDÉ getadelte Umstellung der Einschubverse wegen des störenden כָּהֵם als unnötig und falsch erkannt hatte.

Damit bin ich bei einem zweiten und dritten Einwand BUDDÉ's angelangt, die ich beide mit aufrichtigem Dank als berechtigt und fördernd anerkenne: mit Unrecht habe ich nämlich — in dem Bestreben, wenn möglich keinen Punkt des MT ohne Not zu ändern, und weil ich (MVAG XXII 63₄) mit KAUTZSCH, HUPFELD und NOWACK in diesem vermeintlichen Beziehungswort einen Beweis für die ohnehin allgemein, auch von BUDDÉ anerkannte Lücke in v. 5 erkennen zu müssen glaubte — an dem unglücklichen כָּהֵם festgehalten⁵⁰ und wegen dieses irrtümlich festgehaltenen und mißver-

l'électricité, etc. chez les anciens, p. 175—178; LENORMANT, Revue d'histoire rel. III, 1881, p. 47₉). Die Himmelsbotschaft wird also durch Sternschnuppen (nicht Wetterleuchten! MVAG XXII 48₄) über die ganze Erde verbreitet, so wie irdische Höhenfeuer (MVAG XXII 35₃) den Eintritt des Neumondes überallhin melden (vgl. Hosea 5 „wo die Neumondsfeier — *hodes* — als eine große Feuersbrunst aufgefaßt wird). An die pythagoreische Sphärenharmonie, den *concentus coelorum*, wie die Vulgata כְּבִל־שָׁמַיִם, also כָּבֵל = Laute!, in Hiob 38₃₇ übersetzt, muß also gegen (GUNKEL und meine Ausführungen S. 49₁) hier noch nicht gedacht werden. Zur selben Stelle verweist F. PERLES (OLZ XXI 72) auf F. LUSCHANS Ausführungen, Zeitschr. f. Ethnol. 1916, 426, wonach auf den MVAG XXII 49 angeführten Siegelzylindern Šamaš keine Säge, sondern einen Torschlüssel altertümlicher Art in Händen hält.

⁴⁹ Wenn nämlich doch von Sphärenklängen und einer unhörbaren Himmelsmusik hier die Rede sein sollte.

⁵⁰ Ich habe zu spät bemerkt, daß an diesem Wort früh herumgebessert worden ist. LXX τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σήνωμα αὐτοῦ = אָהֵל gegen אֱהָלֵם, MT hat בָּהֵם — aus Verlegenheit? — gar nicht übersetzt oder es war in den ägyptischen Handschriften schon als beziehungslos, daher unnötig gestrichen. Andererseits zeigt 5 b πάντα τῆς οἰκουμένης, daß die Alexandriner קָצִי חָל (MT קָצִי חָ) lasen, wodurch eine — freilich stilistisch (s. u. S. 34 f.) bedenkliche — Rückbeziehung von בָּהֵם möglich gemacht werden sollte. Die von GRAETZ vorgeschlagene — in der Tat paläographisch besonders in der althebräischen Schrift plausible Korrektur בָּהֵם für בָּהֵם, bzw. die von mir übersehene Lesung DÜHMS בָּהֵם scheint schon R. Jochanan b. Sakkai gelesen zu haben, wenn er nach Pirké di R. Eliezer lehrt, die „Haken“ (קוֹרְקִיטִין) = κρίκος; in der LXX die Ringe, mit denen die Teppiche des Stiftszeltes befestigt


standenen כָּהֶם dann die überlieferte Reihenfolge der zwei Zeilen βασι. γ 8₅₃ || 1 Kön. 8₁₂ M: ἡλιον ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ, Κύριος εἶπε τοῦ κατασκευῶσαι ἐν γούφῳ umstellen müssen, was natürlich, wie BUDDE richtig bemerkt, die ganze Einschaltung nicht eben wahrscheinlicher gemacht hat: in der Tat, wenn ein nachträglich gefundenes Bruchstück einem bereits bekannten, verstümmelten Kunstwerk angefügt werden soll, wird der Altertumsforscher die Ergänzung nur dann als überzeugend anerkennen, wenn sie ungezwungen und ohne willkürliche Veränderung der aneinanderzupassenden Bruchflächen gelingt.

Was nun zunächst das Wort כָּהֶם betrifft, so hatte ich — abgesehen von den MVAG XXII 25₃ erörterten, in der Tat sachlich (u. S. 43₉₄) und paläographisch nicht unmöglichen Lesungen כִּים (GRAETZ und GUNKEL) und כָּהֶם (DUHM),⁵¹ die in der gleich folgenden verbesserten Wiederherstellung den strengen Parallelismus mit כְּשָׁמִים für sich haben — noch eine viel einfachere Lösung unter unveränderter Beibehaltung der Konsonanten (was immer das schönste ist) übersehen: man kann nämlich lesen כָּהֶם⁵² לשמש שם אהל כָּהֶם „der Sonne hat er ein Viehzelt oder Hirtenzelt erbaut“, da „Hirtenzelt“⁵³ „Viehhof“, „Hürde“, sum. TUR, akk. *tarbasu*, AMAŠ, *šupuru*, *tarbasu rabu*, in der babylonischen Meteorologie⁵⁴ die technischen Bezeichnungen für die kleinen und großen Mond-, bzw. Sonnen-

sind) des Himmelszeltes von Ps. 104₂ seien befestigt — *b'mēmē 'ōk'janōs* „in den Wässern des Okeanos“, denn die „Gewässer des Okeanos“ sind *bēn k'sōth hā'āreš* (= *k'sē thebel* von ψ 19, 5 b!), *leben k'sōth haššamaim* = „zwischen den Enden der Erde und den Enden des Himmels“, und die Enden des Himmels sind über die Gewässer des Ozeans gebreitet, wie es heißt (ψ 104₃) „der in den Wässern seine Söller bälket“. — Hiernach steht allerdings das Himmelszelt mit dem unteren Saum der Zeltdecke im Weltmeer, bzw. im Himmelsozean (u. S. 43₉₄) der „oberen Wasser“.

⁵¹ Hierzu könnte man auf Baba Bathra 84 (die Sonne taucht abends ins Feuer der Unterwelt — *Gehinnom* — hinab) verweisen. Vgl. aber u. S. 45 Anm. 100.

⁵² Belege LEVY, Nhb. Wb. I 196_p. Denom. ברמה „Vieh“ Belege — zufällig nur spät bei LEVY, Nhb. Wb. I 196_b, vgl. אהל רעי „Zelt der Weide“ (cf. בקר רעי 1 K. 5, 3 vielleicht beide Male רעים „der Hirten“ zu lesen). Auch *'ohel baham* = arab. *bahm*^{un} = „Kleinvieh“ könnte man lesen und Gen. 33₁₇ die für das Vieh erbauten *sukkoth* zum Vergleich heranziehen.

⁵³ Die Form dieser unter einem Baum aufgeschlagenen Zelte (vgl. Herodot IV 23 über die Zelte der Argypäer [= Urtürken, s. PAULY-WISS. RE II 719]) läßt das babylonische  Schriftzeichen für TUR (REC 231 u. 44) deutlich erkennen.

⁵⁴ JASTROW, Rel. d. Babyl. II 492 cf. 482 ff., 580. KUGLER, Sternkunde I 78, II 99 ff. mit der Tafel 103 ff.

„höfe“ (Halō's)⁵⁵ sind und E-TUR-KALAM-MA „Haus des Hirtenzelt'es der Welt“⁵⁶ in Babylonien auch als Tempelname vorkommt, so daß die Vorstellung einer kosmischen „Hürde“ (TUR-KALAM-MA) oder eines kosmischen Hirtenzelt'es am Himmel ganz gesichert ist.

Jedenfalls entfällt mit der pronominalen Deutung von כָּדָם, ob man nun כָּדָם oder כִּים oder כַּתָּם zu lesen vorzieht, jede Nötigung zur Umstellung von βασ. γ 8₅₃. Ferner muß zur Wahrung der schallanalytisch festgestellten Einheit von 5a, b und c der Einschub hinter 5c und vor 6 gestellt werden. Ein Wechsel in den Bezeichnungen für Sonne שמש und חַרָם, wie ich 46₄ zur Vermeidung zweier gleicher Versanfänge vorschlug, ist nun auch nicht mehr nötig, חַרָם wäre überdies nach SIEVERS melodisch an dieser Stelle kaum möglich, im Gegenteil wird das Gewicht des jubelnden Verses in der neuen Anordnung (u. S. 36) durch die Wiederholung noch mächtiger gesteigert: nachdem die erste Hälfte des Gedichtes erzählt hat, daß die Himmel eine weltbewegende Freudenbotschaft durch lautlose Feuerzeichen von einem Ende der Welt zum andern senden, ein Tag dem andern, eine Nacht — von den dreien der Neumondsdunkelheit! — der andern die Kunde weitergibt, folgt nun die frohe Meldung selber⁵⁷:

<i>Haš-šamajim mäsaprīm kəbōd-</i>	Die Himmel entbieten (des) Gottes
<i>’El(a)</i>	Ruhm,
<i>uma ’āseh jādāw maggīd haraqi’a</i>	Das Werk seiner Hände kündigt
	die Feste.
<i>jōm lajōm jabi’a ’ōmēr</i>	Ein Tag sprüht dem andern die
	Sage zu,
<i>vəlaḵlah ləlaḵlah jehavvēh-dā’ath</i>	Eine Nacht der andern deutet
	die Kunde.
<i>’ējn-’ōmer vāējn debhārīm</i>	Kein Wort wird (laut), kein Reden,
<i>belī nišma’ qōlām</i>	nicht hört man ihre Stimme.

⁵⁵ Griech. ἄλως „Dreschtenne“ — wegen der kreisförmigen Spur des Dreschschlittens rund um die Getreidehaufen. Abb. Enc. Bibl. c. 83, Fig. 11. Ps. Arist. de mundo 4: „ἄλως ἐστὶν λαμπρότης ἀστρου περιούγιος.“

⁵⁶ HOMMEL, Aufs. und Abhandl. 405.

⁵⁷ Somit sprechen im zweiten Teil die Himmel, die Tage und Nächte, nicht der Dichter. Auch wenn in 5b, den Worten des Dichters קָצִי חַבֵּל LXX πέρατα οἰκουμένης im Plural zu lesen wäre, könnten sich die Worte der himmlischen Botschaft nicht auf diese Einleitung zurückbeziehen („an ihnen — d. h. an den Enden der Erde“), wie ich 1910, Weltenmantel, S. 601, geglaubt habe.

*bəkhāl-hā'arēs jaza' qavvām*⁵⁸

*ubiqəzeh thebel milləhem*⁵⁸:

*laš-šēmēs sām 'ōhel-behām*⁵⁹

*šemeš jada' baš-šamajim*⁶⁰

*'El(a)*⁶¹ *amarlā*⁶²: *šəkōn*⁶³ *ba-*
'arāphel!



Über die ganze Erde erstreckt
sich ihr Umschwung,

Bis an die Enden der Welt ihr
Meilenlauf:

Für die Sonne hat er ein Hirten-
zelt erbaut,

Die Sonne hat er im Himmel
erkannt.

(der) Gott gebot ihr: ruhe im
Dunkeln!

⁵⁸ Im Anschluß an die MVAG XXII 70₁ zu 46₂, 48₆₇ festgestellte Bedeutung „Kreislauf“, wörtlich „Zirkelschnur“, angepflochte Meßschnur möchte ich noch hinzufügen, daß der weltumgebende  „grüne Kreis“ von Chagiga 11 b auf den ägyptischen Ausdruck *wld wr.t*  „die große Grüne“ für den

Ozean (MASPERO, *Bibl. égyptol.* I 341, cf. ROEDER, *Ägypt. Gramm., Wörterb.*, S. 67 zu Tafel 13, 8) zurückgeht. Gegen die Beibehaltung von *קום* *קאָנאָן* — statt *קלם* *קלָם* *φθόγγος*, *ἄχος* — scheint zunächst der Parallelismus mit „milləhem“ *ῥήματα* *αὐτῶν* zu sprechen, wie mir von mehreren Seiten eingewendet wurde. Diese Schwierigkeit wird aber beseitigt durch eine höchst scharfsinnige Erklärung von F. PERLES, der in מלחם das nhb. מל, arab. مِيل, erblickt, dessen rein semitischen Ursprung (*מלל*) schon JOSEF PERLES, *Etym. Studien*, 1870 (MGWJ) erwiesen hat (wonach dann altir. *mile*, cymr.-bret. *mil*, corn. *myl*, *myll*, lat. *milia* mit sing. *mille*, cf. מלל!, ahd. *mila*, *milla* „Meile“, das etymol. den Indogermanisten — s. WALDE, *Lat. etymol. Wb.*² 484 f. — ohnehin große Schwierigkeiten macht — ein Lehnwort wäre wie *μνᾶ* *mina*?). Also „ihre Wegabschnitte“ = „Meilensteine“, wozu lat. *metae coeli* (z. B. „sol ex aequo meta distabat utraque“, „nox mediam caeli metam contigerat“) und die von C. F. LEHMANN-HAUPT, *Beitr. z. A. Gesch.* I 3, 1902, 383 aus Achilles *Tat. Isag. in Arat.* § 18, p. 137 Petav. belegte babylonische Einteilung der Sonnenbahn in ὅροι *ὁρίζων* = מלל „trennen“!, cf. ὅρος, der „Grenzstein“, auf den die Grundschulden eingeschrieben werden), die wieder nach Stadien (deutsch = „Stunden“, bab. KAS-BU = *harranu ariktu*, „Langwegen“), d. h. genau nach dem irdischen Straßenmaß vermessen werden, zu vergleichen wäre; s. auch die in meiner Notiz „Das Pferderennen als Analogiezauber zur Beförderung des Sonnenlaufs“, *Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss.* XI, 1907, S. 150 f., gesammelten Stellen über die Rennbahn der Gestirne. Als schlagende Parallele zu dem Parallelismus von *ק* „Meßschnur“, „Zirkelschnur“ und מל führt F. PERLES *Hiob* 38, an, wo *קִמְדִּיהָ* || zu *קָן* steht.

⁵⁹ Allenfalls *בִּים* oder *בְּרָחִים*.

⁶⁰ *ἄλιον ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ* LXX *βασ.* γ. 8₃₃.

⁶¹ MT *יָדָהּ*. Vgl. o. S. 23 Anm. 10.

⁶² *אמר* heißt also doch nicht „gedenken“, wie ich 49₂ meinte, sondern ganz einfach „sagen“, „gebieten“; „El gebot ihr (der Sonne): lagere dich im Wolken-dunkel!“ Das *ה* von *לה* kann — als bloßes Vokalzeichen aufgefaßt — in archaischer defektiver Schrift ohneweiters fortbleiben, vgl. מל für מלל „voll“ auf der Krug-inschrift von Abydos, EISLER, *Kenit. Weihinschr.* 127, אִי für אִי oder אִי „ich“, *ibid.* 38, 96 (Felseninschrift von Sinai).

⁶³ Die von BUDDE *OLZ* 1919, Sp. 264₁ beanstandete Übersetzung „Beilager halten“ für *שָׁן* ist nun auch überflüssig!

<i>vəhu'</i> ⁶⁴ <i>kəhathan jošē' məhup-</i> <i>pāthō</i> ⁶⁵	Er aber — wie der Bräutigam aus dem Hochzeitszelt her- vorkommt —
<i>jāšiš kəgibbōr laruš 'ōrah</i>	Freut er sich — wie ein Held — seine Bahn zu laufen.
<i>miqəšēh haš-šāmajim mošā'ō</i>	Vom Ende des Himmels ist sein Ausgang
<i>u'thəquphāthō 'al-qəšōtham</i>	Und sein Wendepunkt an ihren Grenzen,
<i>vəējn nistār meħammāthō.</i>	Nichts ist verborgen vor seiner Glut.

In dieser Gestalt erscheint mir die Ergänzung — von den Schönheitsfehlern des ersten unzulänglichen Versuches befreit — nunmehr für sich selbst zu sprechen, und es erübrigt nur noch, auf die kosmologischen Vorstellungen des Dichters genauer einzugehen, als es auf dem beschränkten Raum des Aufsatzes von 1917 möglich war.

Dabei muß vor allem festgestellt werden, daß die von BUDDE verteidigte Rückübersetzung von ἡλιον ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ mit שמש הכין שמש הכין auch sachlich unmöglich ist, wenn anders man nicht, sei es Ps. 19 — oder noch unmöglicher — den „Tempelweihespruch“ Salomonis in die nachexilische Zeit herunterrücken will. Denn von einer „Befestigung“ der Sonne am Himmel — und das heißt doch כין oder הכין in einem Zusammenhang, der die Verwendung

⁶⁴ Hiedurch erübrigt sich von selbst meine erste, in der Tat gezwungene, von GRESSMANN beanstandete Übersetzung dieses Wortes. Es heißt einfach: „El gebot ihr (der Sonne): lagere im Dunkel!, er aber (und er) wie ein Bräutigam heraustritt aus seiner Brautlaube, frohlockt er, wie ein Recke, seine Bahn zu durchlaufen.“ Wenn man — den masoretischen *sōf pasuk*, der viel besser hinter מרחו stünde, ignorierend — so verbindet, entfällt auch der Anstoß, den BUDDE, Sp. 264 — und ebenso brieflich R. KITTEL — an dem auch als *ḥ-veritatis* ohneweiters erklärbaren כחן genommen haben. Zum Gedanken vgl. die Bezeichnung der ersten Nacht des Mondes nach dem „Freiwerden des Mondes von der Sonne“ ليلة البيا, nach Ġauhārī und Tāg el 'arūs (EÜTING, Sin. Inschriften, Berlin 1891, S. 6). Umgekehrt wird die gleiche Erscheinung dargestellt in dem litauischen Liedchen MVAG XXII 23:

„Den Tag darauf ihr Brautbett die Sonne früh verließ,
der Mond, noch gar zu schläfrig, allein sie gehen ließ.“

⁶⁵ Hiezu Jesus Sirach 50,1: „Wie prächtig war er, wenn er aus dem Zelt hervorblickte, wenn er hervortrat hinter dem Vorhange... wie der volle Mond in den Tagen des Festes.“

der farblos abgeschliffenen Bedeutungen durch das Gewicht seiner gehobenen Sprache auszuschließen scheint — kann zwar sehr gut in dem makkabäischen Ps. 74₁₆, auf den sich BUDDÉ mit WELLHAUSEN beruft, die Rede sein — denn damals war die griechische Anschauung, daß auch die scheinbar „freiirrenden“ *πλανῆται* fest in kristallinen Himmelsschalen oder Rädern (*galgalim*) befestigt seien, wie der Edelstein im Ringreif, schon Gemeingut der alten Welt geworden⁶⁶ —, aber nie um 1000 v. Chr.! Gen. 1₁₇ P. „versetzt“, „gibt“ (עָשָׂה יָתֵן) Gott die großen Leuchten בְּרִיקֵי „auf das Gestampfte“, auf den festgetretenen, aufgeschütteten Himmelsdamm (*šupuk šamē*), aber er „befestigt“ doch die frei von Sternbild zu Sternbild schweifenden nicht am Himmel! Die Lesung שֵׁשׁ הַבֵּין בשמים anzuerkennen, würde für den Geschichtsschreiber der antiken Kosmologie zwingen, wenigstens die anaximandrischen *τέρεοι* und *κύκλοι*, wenn nicht die pythagoreischen, ja eudoxischen, aristotelischen oder gar ptolemäischen Sphären als Bestandteile der in Bausch und Bogen sog. „altorientalischen Weltanschauung“ in Salomonische Zeit zurückzusetzen, was für mich — und wohl auch für BUDDÉ? — ein wirklich „schlechthin unmögliches Ergebnis“ ist.

Ganz unhaltbar ist auch die von BUDDÉ, Sp. 265 — sogar als „unerschütterlich“ — eingefügte Behauptung, „wo immer der Mythos von der Sternhochzeit in der Neumondnacht Gestalt gewinne, sei die Sonne der Mann, der Mond das Weib“. Ich habe durchaus nicht auf die Plutarchstelle⁶⁷ und darauf „vergessen“ (BUDDÉ, Sp. 262), daß das wohl — mit Rücksicht auf das „Zunehmen“, d. h. die Schwangerschaft des Mondes (u. S. 40 Anm. 73) nach der Syzygie — die ursprüngliche Fassung des Mythos gewesen sein wird, wohl aber habe ich MVAG XXII 23 aus lettischer, litauischer und altindischer Überlieferung den — somit urarischen —

⁶⁶ Die Rabbinen nennen die Sonne fast regelmäßig *galgal hammah* „Rad“, „Sphäre der Glut“. Das ist eine ganz altmodische Form der griechischen Sphärentheorie, nämlich die Lehre des Anaximander, die auf das Feuerreiben mit Hilfe eines an den Bremsschuh gepreßten Rades zurückgeht (bei Parmenides brennt die heißgelaufene Achse des Sonnenwagenrades!; vgl. MVAG XXII 490). Vgl. zu *galgal hammah* die manichäische *rota ignis*, Weltenmantel 761, Nachtrag zu 202, 2, 3.

⁶⁷ Hiezu habe ich jetzt die ägyptischen Vorlagen gefunden. Beim ägyptischen Neujahrsfest wird nämlich die Vereinigung der kuhköpfig gehörnten Mondgöttin *Hathor* mit der Scheibe (*itn*) des *Re* (= „Sonne“) (E. LEFÉBURE, Sphinx, 1906, X 124 f.), bzw. die der Isis Sothis mit *Re* im Hof, bzw. auf dem Dach ihres Tempels gefeiert (vgl. BOLL, Sphäre 212); zuletzt SETHE, Nachr. d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss., philol.-hist. Kl., 1920, S. 53.

Mythus⁶⁸ belegt, in dem der Mond als Bräutigam, die Sonne als Braut auftritt. Warum soll diese, meinetwegen sekundäre, Form des Mythus zwar bei den Ariern, die seit der Amarnazeit und früher in Palästina als Feudaladel⁶⁹ sitzen, aber nicht ebenso bei den Hebräern, nicht bei jenem König David, der das Zelt Jahves auf einer alten Höhen-„Tenne des Aruna“ (= Varuna,⁷⁰ Οὐρανός) aufgestellt hat⁷¹ (2 Sam. 24₁₆), vorkommen können, wenn doch die altarabischen Inschriften *ʾl* und die weibliche *šams* zu einer Göttersyzygie verknüpfen?

Wenn ferner BUDDE trotz aller MVAG XXII 33 ff. beigebrachten Zeugnisse für die Vorstellung von der „Mondglut“ BURKITTs alten Einwand wegen des מַחְמַח wieder aufnimmt, so muß ich eben weitere Eulen nach Athen tragen und Stellen anführen, an denen gerade vom „Glühen“, d. h. schwachen Leuchten, wie wir sagen würden: „Glimmen“ (TAB, *hamatu*), des Neumondes die Rede ist.⁷²

⁶⁸ S. O. SCHRADER, *Aryan Religion*, Enc. Rel. Eth. II 39 und L. v. SCHROEDER, *Arische Religion* II, Leipzig 1923, 392 ff.

⁶⁹ EISLER, *Ken. Weihinschr.* 770.

⁷⁰ OLDENBERG hat in seiner „Religion der Vedas“²⁴ (Berlin 1917) gezeigt, daß der indische *Varuna* ein Meeresgott ist. Dr. E. FORRER teilt mir nun frdl. mit, daß in der Hauptsprache der Boghazköj-Texte, die er kanesisch nennt, *arunaš* „das Meer“ heißt. Griechisch Οὐρανός ist also der Himmelozean (Belege für diese Vorstellung: Weltenmantel 204₄₅, 481₁ unten), Etym. Magn. 821₁₈. Die „Tenne des Aruna“ — ein Heiligtum derselben Art wie die heilige Tenne (ἄλως) des Apollon in Delphi — ist also ein altes hettitisches Heiligtum des (f)Aruna, und das eherne „Meer“ des späteren Tempels ist durchaus kein so harmloses Spülwasserbecken, sondern ein Idol dieses auch sonst in Kana'an verehrten, auf Münzen z. B. von Rabbat Moab als Poseidon mit dem Fisch und dem Dreizack dargestellten *Arunas*; cf. Oppian, *Halieut.* I 797, wo das Meer ἀραινώσσα Ποσειδῶνος ἄλωη (= Dreschtenne) genannt wird (vgl. hiezu schon M. GEMOLL, *Grundstein* z. Gesch. Israels, Leipzig 1911, 345; Abt LANDERSDORFER VON SCHEYERN, *Hettiter. Probl. u. Bibel, Theol. u. Glaube*, Paderborn 1919, S. 39). Ebenso ist die von FEUCHTWANG MGWJ LIV 535—552, 713—729 behandelte Zeremonie des Wasserausgießens und ihre genaue Entsprechung mit dem von Lucian, *Dea Syria* 13, beschriebenen Meerwassereingießen in den Erdschlund von Mabbug (heute noch in der Gegend von Tell-el-Mashuk fortlebender Ritus!) nun leicht verständlich. Zu kanes. *arunaš* vgl. übrigens skr. *árnas* = „Meer“, „Wasser“, „Flut“.

⁷¹ Auf einen analogen Fall — Ahnenkult des „Abram“ und der „Sarah“ (= *mal-katul*) in der den Hettitern „abgekauften“ Höhle der Ma-Kybela (𐎠𐎵𐎲𐎠𐎫𐎠𐎺𐎠, p für b typisch „mitannische“ Orthographie wie *Hiba* — 𐎶𐎶𐎶 — *Kupā* u. dgl.) — macht mich Pfarrer Dr. EBERHARD HOMMEL aufmerksam.

⁷² F. X. KUGLER, *Sternk. I*, Münster 1907, 278. Index s. v. TAB 2: „*hamatu*“ vom „Neulicht des Mondes“ 102 (12), 104, s. 278 „*ihammat*“ ausdrücklich vom Nachtlager des Mondes gesagt. Dazu KRETZSCHMER, *Einl. i. d. Gesch. d. griech. Sprache*, Göttingen 1896, S. 151, über lateinisch „*luna*“ = Mond = tschech. *luna*, poln. *łuna* „Lohe des Feuers“. JASTROW, *Rel. Bab.* II 571: „ist der Mond glühend

So ungewöhnlich das dem heutigen Leser vorkommen mag,⁷³ so wenig kommt der Geschichtsschreiber der antiken Kosmologie darum herum, daß sich der Babylonier nach dem Zeugnis des Berossos⁷⁴ den lichten Teil des Mondes als brennend oder glühend vorstellte, und daß diese Anschauung von dem allmonatlich durch die συναφή mit der Sonne in Brand gesteckten, bzw. in Glut versetzten und dann allmählich wieder erlöschenden⁷⁵ Mond,⁷⁶ genau wie von den Griechen, auch von den Hebräern geteilt worden ist, wobei ich zu der MVAG XXII 35 beigebrachten, vielleicht als zu spät nicht für voll genommenen Zoharstelle jetzt noch auf den Siraciden (43_{8b}) verweisen kann, der gerade vom Neumond sagt, er lasse das Firmament erglühen (רָצַח, denom. von רָצַח „Glühstein“⁷⁷) durch seinen Glanz. *ʿejn nistar mehammatho* „nichts ist vor seinem Glühen geheim“, „verborgen“ spielt auch nicht von fern auf eine Hitze dieser Glut an, sondern nur auf ihr Leuchten. Mag der Mond auch schwächer leuchten wie die Sonne — auch die Neumondsichel mit dem „aschfahlen Licht“ ist kein verächtliches Nachtlicht in der klaren Wüstenluft! —, so gilt doch mehr von ihm, der bei Tag und

(TAB, hamatu), 572₈“; „glüht (ihmutam) der Mond“. DELITZSCH, Ass. Hwb. 281b zu III, Rawl. 54, 11b. Wer je Weiß- und Grauglut gesehen hat, wird zugeben, daß der Vergleich sehr treffend ist. Cf. Midraš Abba Gorion, WÜNSCHE, Lehrb. II 125: „es gibt ein Feuer, das frißt und nicht trinkt, das ist das Feuer des Mondes.

⁷³ Vgl. aber Hildegard von Bingen (1098—1180), *Physica*, ed. Paul Kayser, ed. princ., Straßburg 1533: „Die Sterne werden vom Mond beleuchtet, denn kommt dieser in Sonnennähe, so empfängt er von ihr seine Glut und wird allmählich ganz mit Licht erfüllt wie ein Scheiterhaufen anglüht, wenn er aber voll ist, so daß er mit einer gesegneten Frau verglichen werden kann, gibt er sein Licht an die Sterne ab.“

⁷⁴ DIELS, *Dox.*, p. 200 zu Aet. plac. II 28₁, 29₂: Βήρωσος ἡμπυρωτὸν σφαῖραν τὴν σελήνην . . Βήρωσος (deficere lunam) κατὰ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιστροφὴν τοῦ ἀπυρώτου μέρους. Vitruv IX 1, 16 „Berosus . . pilam esse ex dimidia parte candentem. Dazu DIELS, *Elem.* 10₄, den gefälschten Brief des Epikur an Pythodoros.

⁷⁵ Hieran mag die Heraklitesche Vorstellung (fr. 30, DIELS, *FVS* 2) von einem kosmischen πῦρ ἀπτόμενον μέτρα καὶ ἀποσβεννύμενον, das „regelmäßig aufflammende, regelmäßig wieder erlöschende Feuer“ anknüpfen.

⁷⁶ Belege MVAG XXII 31. Dazu noch Apuleius, *Metam.* XI 2 „udi ignes“ („feuchte Gluten“) der luna. Weitere Vergleiche des Mondlichtes mit brennendem Feuer bei Sophocl. fr. 490 N; Stob. ecl. phys. 550 ff. DIELS, *Dox.* 355, Ages. bei Plutarch, *fac. i. orbe lunae*, 4; Joh. Lyd., ed. Roether 104 f. Theophr. fr. 6₂₇ und *ibid.* 12. Cornutus, ed. Osann., p. 325.

⁷⁷ Glühend gemachte Steine, die zum Kochen und Backen dienen; s. HEILBRONN, *Allg. Völkerkunde*, Teubner, 1915, S. 28 f. An glühenden Steinen ist Weiß- und Grauglut am schönsten zu betrachten.

Nacht am Himmel gesehen werden kann, den der Grieche (Hymn. orph. IX 7) *φιλάρχωνος πανδερχής*, der Sumerer EN-ZU, den „Herrn der Weisheit“, der Äthiopier *hakim*, den „Wissenden“, der Katabane *Hukm*, „Weisheit“, nennt,⁷⁸ als von der bei Nacht schlafenden Sonne, daß nichts auf der Welt vor ihm verborgen ist! Ja nach der neuen, o. S. 36₆₃ vorgeschlagenen Lesung „El gebot der Sonne im Dunkeln zu ruhen, er aber geht aus (= auf) . . .“ scheint ja gerade das der Gedanke des Liedes zu sein, daß der Mond allsehend die Welt durchzieht, während die Sonne auf ihrem Nachtlager ruhen darf.⁷⁹

Für den unermüdlichen Reckenlauf des Mondes habe ich ja schon MVAG XXII 51_r die babylonische Parallele beigebracht.⁸⁰ Warum muß das (BUDDE, 262), vom Monde gesagt, „eine arge Übersetzung“ sein, und warum soll schließlich, wenn es so wäre, ein orientalischer Panegyrikus auf den Mondgott frei von Übertreibungen sein? Ist es keine Übertreibung, wenn der Mondhymnus von Ur behauptet, der schüchterne, blasse *Deus Lunus* von Karrhai habe unter den Göttern, seinen Brüdern, „keinen Rivalen“ (Šamaš also nicht ausgenommen!)? Um wieviel mehr kann der Wüstensohn so sprechen, für den der Mond schlechthin אֱל oder אלה „der Gott“, Šams aber dessen „Magd“ (*לַשִּׁמְשׁ*, also „Dienstbote“ oder „Botenläuferin“ — somit nur ein *mal'akh Bel* oder ἄγγελος Κυρίου⁸¹ ist!

Daß der Mondgott das Sternenzelt erbaut, bzw. webt, wäre nur wunderlich (BUDDE, 261), wenn die beiden wirklich im Verhältnis

⁷⁸ NIELSEN, MVAG XXI 255_r, ZDMG 68, 717f. Auch „Ahura Maçda“, der „wissende Herr“, ist eher ein alter Mond-, wie ein früherer Sonnengott. Vgl. HOMMEL, Grundr. 202₅, über die Verwandtschaft des persischen Keilschriftideogramms für Maçda und des babyl. Zeichens für *iluSIN*.

⁷⁹ Die umgekehrte Vorstellung in dem litauischen Liedchen S. 37₆₄, das sich natürlich auf den Morgen nach dem Verschwinden des Mondes in den Strahlen der Abendsonne bezieht, während in ψ 19 — einem *hillāl*-Lied, wie man arabisch, einem *hallāl*-Psalm, wie man hebräisch sagen würde — zur Begrüßung der neuen Sichel, die drei mondlosen Tage und Nächte — *jōm l° jōm . . . lailah l° lailah* — schon vorüber sind.

⁸⁰ Zu Ps. 19_{7a, b} „vom Ende des Himmels sein Aufgang, an seinen Enden seine Wende“; vgl. im großen Mondhymnus von Ur „der vom Grund des Himmels bis zur Höhe des Himmels“ — also vom tiefsten bis zum höchsten Jahreszeitenstand des Mondes am Himmel — „strahlend dahinwandelt“.

⁸¹ *Mal'akh-Bel* = *Sol sanctissimus*, bilingue Inschrift vom Capitol CIL VI, 710, Dessau 4337. Vgl. meine Tabelle zum Josephstraum, Weltenmantel, S. 278/9 Anm. 3.

von „Träger und Getragenen“ stünden, wenn Sonne und Mond vom Sternenzelt „getragen“, „in ihre Bahnen gezwungen und regiert“, bzw. an das Sternenzelt „gebunden“ wären, wie BUDDE, Sp. 261 meint. Aber auch das ist ebenso anachronistisch wie die S. 259 geäußerte Meinung, Sonne und Mond müßten „ihre Bahn verlassen und das feste Gewölbe, in das sie eingefügt sind“ (nach damaliger Anschauung eben durchaus nicht!), „durchbrechen“, um ins Innere des Himmels zu gelangen, ins *kirib šamē*, wo nach meiner ganz bündigen, nur durch die notgedrungene Kürze beschränkten Erklärung MVAG XXII 50, der ἑρὸς γάμος stattfindet. Sie brauchen durchaus nicht mit dem Kopf durch die *moenia mundi*⁸² zu stürmen, sondern gehen bescheidenlich durch eines der zwölf Tore des Himmels, zu denen sie ordnungsgemäße Hausschlüssel haben (o. S. 33₄₈), aus unserer Welt — dem *ōlām hazēh*, dem πρῶτος χώρος oder κόσμος οὗτος⁸³ — hinaus.⁸⁴

Die von BUDDE, Sp. 259f. weiter beanstandeten unvollziehbaren Vorstellungswidersprüche bestehen eben in der antiken Kosmologie in Wirklichkeit gar nicht. Natürlich ist ursprünglich das Himmelszelt schlechthin gleich dem Himmelsgewölbe, sein Boden die Erde, auf der wir stehen, und der Innenraum die Welt der Menschen und Götter.⁸⁵ Aber bei dieser einfachen Vorstellung bleibt es nicht lange: das Erscheinen und Verschwinden der Gestirne — und der auf demselben „Weg“ entgleitenden Seelen — zwingt zur Vorstellung zunächst eines „Jenseits“ — *ultra montes* oder *ultra mare* —, das von unserer Welt durch eine Mauer der Berge und durch den Vorhang des Himmels,⁸⁶ das *paroketh* des ἄγιον κοσμικόν geschieden ist, etwa wie der *maḥram*, die Weiberabteilung,

⁸² Belege für diese Vorstellung: Weltenmantel 620₂.

⁸³ Ibid. 623 ff.


⁸⁴ Mondhymnus von Ur, WEBER, Lit. d. Bab., S. 130: „der da öffnet das Tor des Himmels“; Šamaš mit dem Schlüssel am Himmelstor, JASTROW, Bildermappe Nr. 176, MVAG XXII 49, irrtümlich als Säge gedeutet, s. LUSCHAN, MVAG XXII 365, Abb. 9, Taf. V; Weltschöpfungsepos 9 f.: „er öffnete Tore auf beiden Seiten“ (scil. „im Palast *E-šarra* [= Groß- oder Welthaus], den er als Himmel geschaffen“, Taf. IV, Z. 145). Dazu Henochbuch 72 ff. bei KAUTZSCH, Pseudepigr. II 278, über die Türen und Fenster des Himmels und ihre Benützung durch Sonne und Mond. Über die Himmelsfenster vgl. noch Exod. rabba, XV 22.

⁸⁵ ARNIM, Fragm. Stoic. II 327: „*mundus quasi communis deorum atque hominum domus*.“

⁸⁶ Weltenmantel 600₈, 252₁, 250₇, 191₃.

vom übrigen Beduinenzelt.⁸⁷ Hinter diesem *paroketh*, diesem *paraku* = „Zelt“ *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, im großen Welthaus⁸⁸ oder -hof⁸⁹ zelten die Gestirne im Westen,⁹⁰ bzw. Norden,⁹¹ aus ihm „gehen sie heraus“, in dieses „hinein“, offenbar durch die Eingänge zwischen den Zeltdecken.⁹²

So muß man sich erklären, daß nachmals nicht mehr der ganze Himmel als Zelt gilt, sondern man ein „Zelt“, einen „Baldachin“ u. dgl. in einer bestimmten Himmelsgegend nahe dem Horizont in den Sternen zu sehen meinte,⁹³ das dann möglicherweise wirklich „am Meer“⁹⁴ (*בים*) oder „an der Wassertiefe“ (*בתהום*) zu stehen

⁸⁷ Siehe MUSIL, Arabia Petraea III, S. 128 f. Fig. 17. Auch der durch Vorhänge abgetrennte Winkel, wie ihn das ägyptische Hieroglyphenzeichen  *ip* = „Harem“ abbildet, ist zu vergleichen.

⁸⁸ Im einräumigen Hallenhaus wird mit fortschreitender Kultur für Überzeltung des Schlafalters = „Himmel“ bett, *θαλαμος*, wörtlich = *šalmu* „Schattendach“ gesorgt. Vgl. des Priscus' Schilderung der Königshalle des Attila, CHR. RANCK, Kulturgesch. d. deutschen Bauernhauses¹, 1913, S. 14.

⁸⁹ Jüd. Belege: Weltenmantel 625₇.

⁹⁰ Auch der Weltbaum als Träger des Himmelszeltes — ursprünglich der ganze Nachthimmel als schattende Baumkrone aufgefaßt (Weltenmantel 575₅, 766 zu 326₀) — wird später im Westen, im Land der Hesperiden oder im Götterland des Ostens stehend gedacht, schließlich verdoppelt an den zwei Enden des Himmels unter die Sterne versetzt (Weltenmantel 276₄, Nachtr. S. 764).

⁹¹ Daher die Vorstellung vom Seligenland der Hyperboräer im Norden. Dazu Weltenmantel 623₁.

⁹² Weltenmantel 250₇.

⁹³ Vgl. den arabischen Sternnamen (s. IDELERS gleichnam. Buch, S. 272 f.) *el hiba* „das Zelt“ für das (zu Häupten der Jungfrau!) stehende Sternbild des Raben, auch *'ars' el simak* = „Laube der Jungfrau“, wörtl. „des Himmelsdaches“ (Weltenmantel 619₈) genannt. *'ars'* (bab. *irsū*, cf. Koran 69₁₇ *'arša rabbika*, HOMMEL, Grundr. 318, cf. 319 a) ist natürlich der MVAG XXII 27₄, 5 nach ROBERTSON SMITH besprochene Ausdruck ערש „Brautlaube“, wozu noch babyl. *erisū* „Bräutigam“, *irsitu* „Verlobung“ (ZIMMERN. Akk. Lehnw., Leipzig 1914, S. 46) zu vergleichen ist. Diese Brautlaube steht am Himmel über dem Sternbild der Jungfrau (daher bei Babrios 24 die γάμοι ἡλίου θέρους ὥρη im Hochsommer!) häufig als stillende Göttermutter mit dem Kinde dargestellt wird. In der Himmelsbeschreibung des Teukros von Babylon (d. h. der ägyptischen Stadt dieses Namens, Fostat-Kairo!) heißt diese Laube (BOLL, Sph. 210 ff.) der Jungfrau ἀτρίον, d. i. der bei Joel 2₁₆ mit *huppah* für „Brautkammer“ gebrauchte Ausdruck חדר. Mit *ater* = „dunkel“ (also „berufter“ Raum) hat *atrium* nichts zu tun (vgl. WALDE, Etym. Wb. lat. Spr. 2, S. 68), t für ṭ ist etruskisch-kleinasiat. Aussprache, „הדרים des Südens“ am Himmel, Hiob 9₉; SCHIAPARELLI, Astron. im A. T. 58 ff.

⁹⁴ Siehe Weltenmantel 600₅. Vgl. בעין „an der Quelle“ I Sam. 29₁₇, נהר „am Flusse“ Ezech. 10₁₅, „Auf“, „über dem Meer“, wie ich MVAG XXII 25₃ meinte, müßte *'al panēj təhom* heißen. Vgl. R. Johanan b. Sakkais o. S. 33 Anm. 50 angeführten Midraš.

schien — weshalb diese beiden Lesarten in Ps. 19_{5c} in der Tatsächlich allenfalls zulässig wären —, bis man schließlich dazu kam, 12 oder gar 28 verschiedene solche „Zelte“ oder „Häuschen“, bzw. „Orte“⁹⁵ am Himmel, bzw. seinem wasserumflossenen unteren Rande,⁹⁶ dem „Weg des E-A“ — daher bei Pherekydes „Okeanos-häuser“ ὠκεανοῦ δώματα⁹⁷ genannt — anzunehmen.

Von diesem „Jenseits“ land der Seelen und Götter auf gleicher Fläche mit der Erde ist die Vorstellung einer überhimmlischen Welt ober uns, eines Oberstocks des Welthauses ganz verschieden. Die Weltenmantel 621 ff. Abb. 76–79 erörterten Kosmogramme des Mar 'Abā von Nisibis mit den zugehörigen Texten, insbesondere des Severian von Gabala (625₃), werden BUDDE (zu 260₁) zeigen, daß nach Ps. 104₃ („der auf Wasser bälkt seine Söller“) das Himmelszelt auch — so wie 2 Sam. 16₂₂ die Hochzeitslaube des Absalom auf dem flachen Dach seines Hauses errichtet wird — ohneweiters auf den zu tiefblauem χρύσταλλος (חרק) verfestigten „oberen Gewässern“ aufgebaut gedacht werden kann. In diesen „Oberstock“ der Welt, ins „Innere des Himmels“ gelangen die Gestirngötter über die Spiralarampen des in jenen Kosmogrammen ganz gut ersichtlichen, in den Himmel hineinragenden⁹⁸ Weltberges im Norden,⁹⁹ von dem sich nur die eine Hälfte — auf der der Tagesumlauf der Gestirne stattfindet¹⁰⁰ — innerhalb des

⁹⁵ betu oder parakku am Himmel, HOMMEL, ZDMG XLV, 1891, 607₂; WEIDNER, OLZ 1912, 114 f. zu THOMPSON, Rep. 267, R. 13–14. Griech. οἶκοι oder πύργοι (= bab. pirk kakkabani WEIDNER, l. c.), lat. domus, hebr. 'ōhalim šel ma'alalah „Zelte der Höhe“, Jalq. zu Num. 24₅. Orte, Tempel bab. išreti plur. zu asratu von asru = „Ort“; cf. die 'Ašerah = „Wohnung Gottes“, Abbild. Weltenmantel 208, fig. 32. Die 28 Nachtlager (išdu) des Mondes, s. WEIDNER, Handb. bab. Astr. 50 ina išdi tamarti „Sin „in dem Nachtlager“ (das ist die sekhinah des Gottes!) „in dem der Mond wieder sichtbar wird“. Dies zu MVAG XXII 32₂ und zu BUDDE 261, Z. 3 ff. Sowohl der Mond als die Sonne — jeder Planet überhaupt! — haben nach astrologischer Lehre feste οἶκοι oder domicilia am Himmel. S. BOUCHÉ-LECLERQ, L'astrol. Greque, Paris 1899, p. 182 ff., cf. 276 ff.

⁹⁶ Weltenmantel 209₃: Etym. Magn. 821₁₈.

⁹⁷ Weltenmantel 208₂.

⁹⁸ Das ist Naturbeobachtung an hohen Bergen: der Libanon „über den Wolken aufragend“ in der Grabinschrift von Schech Abd-el-Gurna, ed. SETHE, SBBA 1906, 356 ff. GRESSMANN, TUB, S. 243, Nr. 2.

⁹⁹ Ursprünglich die Gebirge nördlich von Mesopotamien, später auch — unsichtbar blau glänzend — als der „Glasberg“ des Märchens gedacht.

¹⁰⁰ Weltenmantel 625: R. Eliezer sagt: „... wenn die Sonne zur Nordwestecke gelangt, biegt sie ein und steigt über den Himmel.“ Daß die Sonne nachts unter die Erde hinabsänke (nach BUDDE 251 also in der thehom unter der Erde, in der

„Berghauses“ (E-KUR) der Welt, die andere Hälfte aber, durch die Tore, bzw. durch Höhlen und Klüfte in diesem Berg zugänglich, auf der nächtlichen hyperboräischen Außenseite hinter der Nordmauer der Welt befindet.¹⁰¹

„Unvollziehbare Vorstellungen“ dürften nach diesen Erklärungen kaum mehr zurückbleiben, wenn auch die unsichere Lesung der Zeichen **בְּהָם** sichere Angaben, wie die Kosmologie des Psalmisten zu denken ist, beträchtlich erschwert. Wer sich für *'ōhel beḥām* „Hirtenzelt“ entscheidet, wird sogar mit der Möglichkeit rechnen müssen, daß damit und mit der *huppah*, dem „Brautbaldachin“, nichts anderes gemeint ist als ein TUR oder *tarbasu*, ein halbkreisförmiger, auf dem Horizont aufstehender Lichtbogen um die untergehende Sonne,¹⁰² in den eingehend die Mondsichel verschwindet, und den der Dichter ohneweiters als eine vom Mond über der Sonne und für die Sonne erbaute *huppa* auffassen konnte. —

Zum Schlusse möchte ich noch bemerken, daß mir BUDDE (Sp. 263₁ und Z. 64 unten) den Wert der kabbalistischen Überlieferungen — verbreiteten Vorurteilen gehorchend — viel zu niedrig einzuschätzen scheint. Ich hoffe in den Schriften unserer neuen „J. A. Widmannstetter-Gesellschaft zur Erforschung der Kabbala“¹⁰³ zeigen zu können, daß der kabbalistische Midraš nichts anderes ist als die Bibelexegese der mit Philon von Alexandria gleichzeitigen und gleichgesinnten palästinensischen Allegoristen, der *doršē rešumoth* des Talmud.

Sehr gern hätte ich auch BUDDES Urteil über meine zugleich mit der von Ps. 19 unternommene Ergänzung des ebenso wichtigen Salomonischen Psalms 132 gelesen! Vielleicht darf ich noch hinzufügen, daß ich jetzt auch Ps. 29 mit der bei den LXX erhaltenen Überschrift *Ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαβὶδ ἐξ ὁδοῦ σκηνῆς* — aber ohne

Unterwelt, nicht im Himmel [*baššamajim*] ihr Zelt haben müsse), wird *Pesahim* 94 b (Weltenmantel 625₂) ausdrücklich als die nicht jüdische, griechische Meinung bezeichnet. Auch bei den Griechen ist sie spät. Noch bei Homer droht Helios als äußerstes Gewaltmittel *δύσομαι εἰς Αἴδαο καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσιν φασίτω*; für gewöhnlich tut er das aber nie, sondern fährt auf dem Okeanos in seiner Barke von Westen nach Osten zurück, um dort wieder den Wagen zu besteigen und himmeln zu fahren.

¹⁰¹ Belege: Weltenmantel 623₁.

¹⁰² Abb. bei KUGLER, Sternnglauben, II. Buch, Taf. 9.

¹⁰³ Als erster Band ist eben in Leipzig, bei Drugulin 1923 Dr. G. SCHOLMS Bahirübersetzung, als zweiter seine *Bibliographia Qabbalistica* erschienen.

dem ganz aus dem Ton fallenden v. 9c mit der Erwähnung des salomonischen *hekal!*¹⁰⁴ — für echt davidisch und zum salomonischen *sefer-haš-šir* gehörig ansehe.

Abgeschlossen in Feldafing, im März 1924.

¹⁰⁴ V. 2 ist für בַּחֲדֹרֹת־קֹדֶשׁ (verschrieben wegen חֹדֶר v. 4) offensichtlich בַּחֲדֹרֹת־קֹדֶשׁ zu lesen; חֲדָרָה gleichbedeutendes fem. zu חֹדֶר (o. S. 43_{9,3}) = Brautgemach, cf. בעֲלֵת־הַחֲדָרֹת. auf der karthagischen Inschrift CIS I 77, חֲדָרֹת „Gemach im Heiligtum“; LIDZBARSKI, Handb. 271 (LXX ἐν ἀλλῇ ἀγίᾳ αὐτοῦ, בַּחֲצֹתֹת קֹדֶשׁ wie Jes. 62, 9). Gemeint ist das davidische Zelt der Lade, in dem Jahve nun *la-mabbul* thronet, weil nach einer alten, schon dem Isaiah bekannten Sage unter dem heiligen Felsen auf dem Zion die Urflut ruht und bei der Ausgrabung der Tempelfundamente fast hervorgebrochen wäre (nähere Belege in meiner anderswo erscheinenden Abhandlung über Is. 28₁₆). V. 9c: וּבְדִיכְלוּ כָּלֹ אָמַר כְּבוֹד ist eine spätere liturgische Randbemerkung zu 2b, in der בְּדִיכְלוּ sich auf בַּחֲדָרֹת und כְּבוֹד אָמַר כָּלֹ auf הָבֹ לַיהוָה כְּבוֹד שְׁמִי bezieht; in v. 3b ist יְהוָה zu streichen, in 9b an Stelle des ו von וַיַּחֲשֶׁף aber ein יְהוָה einzufügen; v. 7 ist etwa nach DUHMS Vorschlag zu ergänzen. Zu den sieben Donner-קִלְוֹת des Textes denke ich mir sieben Posaunenstöße in der begleitenden Musik.

A CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF STUDIES ON HEBREW RELIGION FROM 1918 TO 1924

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, Bryn Mawr College

THIS article is a continuation of Ackerman's bibliography in ATR II 57-70 and should be used in connection with our former bibliographies in JSOR, from where many entries should be repeated here. We shall divide this section into Religion in general, the problem of evil, eschatology, Yahwism, prophetism, the Iranian influence, early Judaism, and ethical aspects of Hebrew religion.

a) General

1503. R. A. Aytoun. *God in the O.T.* New York, Doran, 1923, pp. 163.
- 1503a. G. A. Barton. *The Religion of Israel.* New York, Macmillan, 1918, pp. 305. Rev. Greenstone, JQR 11, 396-402; Fullerton, HTR 12, 455-8; König, TLB 42, 82-3; Maynard, ATR 2, 157-60; Smith, AJTh 23, 232-3.
1504. L. W. Batten. *Some features of the Religion of Israel.* Construct. Quarterly 9, 469-81.
- 1504a. A. Bertholet. Cf. 1508.
- 1504b. G. H. Box. *Worship (Hebrew).* ERE 12, 788-95.
1505. W. G. de Burgh. *The Legacy of the Ancient World.* New York, Macmillan, 1924, pp. 41-76.
1506. A. Causse. *Israël et la vision de l'humanité.* Pp. 152. Cf. Causse, RHPR 4, 73-7; Rev. McFadyen, ET 35, 458; T. H. Robinson, Exp. Aug. 1924, 150-2.
1507. S. M. Cooke. *(Hebrew) Purification.* ERE 10, 489-90.
- 1507a. G. L. della Vida. *Storia e religione nell'Oriente Semitico.* Rome, 1924, pp. 165.
- 1507b. J. Döllner. *Die Reinheits- und Speisegesetze des A.T.* Münster, Aschendorff, 1917, pp. 312.
1508. F. Giesebrecht. *Die Grundzüge der israelitischen Religionsgeschichte.* 3rd edit. By A. Bertholet, 1919, pp. 128. Rev. Caspari, TLB 40, 283-4.

- 1508a. T. R. Glover. *Progress in religion to the Christian era*. New York, Doran, 1922, pp. 104-54; 240-59; 306-30.
1509. J. Hänel. *Der Schriftbegriff Jesu. Studie zur Kanongeschichte und religiösen Beurteilung des A. T.* 1919, pp. 224.
- 1509a. Hebert. *La religion avant Jésus-Christ*. Paris, Lethielleux, 1915, pp. 214. Rev. Synave, RSPT 9, 214.
1510. P. Heinisch. *Personifikationen und Hypostasen im A. T. und im Alten Orient*. Münster, Aschendorff, 1921, pp. 60. Rev. Synave, RSPT 11, 155.
1511. J. Hempel. *Gebet und Frömmigkeit im A. T.* 1922, pp. 46. Rev. Baumgartner, DLZ, 1924, 993-4.
1512. G. Hölscher. *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion*. Gießen, Topelmann, 1922. Rev. Elhorst, NTT 13, 60-6; Hempel, OLZ, 1923, 448-9; Mercer, ATR, 165-6; Schmidt, TLZ 48, 289-92; Sellin, Theol. d. Geg. 17, 133-4; J. M. P. Smith, AJSL 39, 292-3.
- 1512a. D. Houston. *The achievement of Israel. A study in Revelation applied to Life*. London, Clarke, 1923, pp. 443. Cf. ET 34, 443.
1513. W. J. Hutchins. *The religious experience of Israel*. New York, Assoc. Press, 1920, pp. 519.
1514. D. M. Kay. *Semitic Religions*. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1923, pp. 1-110. Cf. ET 34, 539-40 (Mercer, JSOR 8, 220).
1515. H. A. Kent. *The Forgiveness of sins in the O. T.* 1921, 21, 365-86.
1516. C. M. Kerr. *Propitiation (Biblical)*. ERE 10, 394-5.
1517. A. Kirchner. *Marduk von Babylon und Jesus Christus. Ein Beitrag zur Apologie Christi auf religionvergleichender Grundlage*. Gladbach, 1922, pp. 144. Rev. Teloni, Bil. 21, 78-9; Maynard, JSOR 9, 89-90.
1518. R. Kittel. *Die Religion des Volkes Israels*. Leipzig, Quelle, 1921, pp. 217. Rev. Hänel, TLB 42, 66-70; Synave, RSPT 11, 126-8.
1519. A. Knudson. *The Religious Teaching of the O. T.* New York, Abingdon Press, 1918, pp. 416. Rev. Badé, HTR 13, 85-7; Böhl, NTS 2, 181 f.; Greenstone, JQR 11, 396-402; König, TLB 40, 296-71; Matthews, JSOR 3, 90-2; Mercer, ATR 1, 434-5; J. M. P. Smith, BW 53, 444 f.; D. E. Thomas, AJTh 23, 530-2.

1520. E. König. *Israels Religion nach ihrer Stellung in der Geistesgeschichte der Menschheit*. Gütersloh, 1919, pp. 68. Rev. Caspari, TLB 42, 22.
1521. — *Theologie des A. T., kritisch und vergleichend dargestellt*. Stuttgart, Belser, 1922, pp. 356. Rev. Caspari, TLB 43, 37–8; Synave, RSPT 12, 66–7.
1522. R. Kreglinger. *La religion d'Israël*. Bruxelles, Lamertin, 1922, pp. 353. Rev. Synave, RSPT 13, 90–2.
1523. M. Löhr. *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*. 2nd edit. Berlin, pp. 146. Rev. Rust, TLZ 45, 26–7.
1524. — *The Religion of Israel in the Light of the Religions of the Ancient East*. BS, 1921, 295 ff.
- 1524 a. R. A. S. Macalister. *Thirty Years of Palestine Exploration*. ET 33, 87–92.
- 1524 b. J. C. McFadyen. *Vows (Hebrew)*. ERE 12, 654–9.
1525. J. A. Maynard. *The Element of Controversy in the Documents of the Pentateuch*. ATR 7, 145–52.
1526. — *Three Daughters of Israel*. ATR 2, 227–32.
1527. S. A. B. Mercer. *Words for Sin in the O. T.* ATR 2, 234–6.
- 1527 a. J. A. Montgomery. *The Hebrew Religion*, in "Religions of the Past and Present." Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1918, pp. 76–113.
1528. J. F. Moore. *History of Religion*. Vol. II, 1919. New York, Scribners, 1918, pp. 1–80. Rev. Casanowicz, JQR 12, 527–30; E. W. Hopkins, HTR 13, 290–2; Mercer and Hallock, JSOR 4, 98 ff. Cf. Maynard 1526.
1529. J. Morgenstein. *The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel*. Hebrew Union Coll. Ann., 1924, 13–78.
1530. D. Neumark. *The Philosophy of the Bible*. Cincinnati, Ark Pub. Co., 1918, pp. 368. Rev. Mercer, JSOR 3, 47–8.
1531. J. Nikel, in Huby, "*Christus, Manuel d'histoire des Religions*." Paris, Beauchesne, 1916, pp. 1340. Rev. Synave, RSPT 9, 213–4.
1532. E. Pace. *Ideas of God in Israel*. London, Allen, 1924, pp. 260. Rev. Guillaume, Theol. 9, 51 ff.
1533. F. Perles. *Prayer (Biblical and pre-talmudic)*. ERE 10, 191–3.
- 1533 a. R. H. Pfeiffer. *The Polemic against Idolatry in the O. T.* JBL 43, 229–40.
- 1533 b. W. Popper. *Pilgrimage, Hebrew and Jewish*. ERE X, 23–4.

1534. T. W. Rothstein. *Die Religion des A. T. im Lichte geschichtlicher Wahrhaftigkeit*. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1921, pp. 104. Rev. Hänel, TLB 43, 99-100; Sellin, Theol. d. Geg. 17, 105-6.
1535. H. Seeger. *Die Triebkräfte des religiösen Lebens in Israel und Babylon*. Tübingen, Möhr, 1923, pp. 122. Rev. Löhr, OLZ 26, 574-5; Sellin, Theol. d. Geg. 17, 132-3; Mercer, JSOR 8, 216.
1536. E. Sellin. *Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in Palästina und die israelitische Religionsgeschichte*. DLZ, 1923, 63-76.
1537. H. P. Smith. *Priest, Priesthood (Hebrew)*. ERE 10, 307-11.
1538. J. Touzard. *Double Courant religieux en Israël*. Rev. prat. d'Apol. 15, vol. 29, 413-20.
1539. A. J. Wensinck. *The significance of ritual in the Religion of Israel*. TT, 1919, 95-105.

AYTOUN's excellent study of development of idea of God. BARTON, a college text book rich in personal ideas, evolutionary treatment. BATTEN stresses diversity in O. T. religion. CAUSSE, masterly survey of religious evolution. DE BURGH emphasizes abiding importance of Hebrew contributions to the world. DELLA VIDA, a series of articles on Semitic history and religion. HÄNEL treats of the relation of our conception of Christ to that of the O. T. and of the Canon. GIESEBRECHT-BERTHOLET, current academic critical attitude. HEINISCH compares with Assyro-Babylonia, Egypt and Avestan religion. He finds that in the O. T., the attributes of God are not personified while elsewhere they become gods. Sin is only personified in a poetical way. Satan is a spirit subject to God. HEMPEL studies prayer life in O. T. and influence of exile upon piety. HÖLSCHER writes from the point of view of Wundt's psychology. His work is most important, and embodies many new points of view. HOUSTON, a study of religious values. HUTCHINS, popular series of meditations, well informed. KAY, three lectures on Hebraism, one on Judaism, all excellent. KENT believes that the Hebrew scriptures are the records of aristocrats but there was a pagan Semitic inheritance preserved by the people. He traces the evolution of the idea of propitiation for sin to the nobler piety in Galilean apocalyptic. KIRCHNER, apologetic, stresses originality and value of O. T. doctrine of evil and redemption. KITTEL rejects the Kenite hypothesis and shows the influence of Canaanite cults, believes that

mosaism is a national and ethical henotheism. KNUDSON, a topical study of religious contents of O.T., excellent and moderate. KÖNIG 1521 studies thoroughly theology, cosmology, hamartiology, soteriology of O.T. KREGLINGER, evolutionary treatment. LÖHR emphasizes originality of O.T. religion. MAYNARD 1525 stresses importance of controversial attitude which leads to negative imitation. MAYNARD 1526 on the relation of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam to Hebraism, in a critic of no. 1528. MOORE, excellent outline. MORGENSTERN finds that the Canaanite calendar continued until 608 when a luni-solar calendar was introduced with the D reformation, the months being called by their ordinal numbers. The Third, or Babylonian calendar, was slowly introduced, little used if at all, before the fourth century B.C. There follows a masterly study of festivals. NEUMARK, an original study. Prophets did not condemn sacrifices. Specially good treatment of the idea of God. NIKEL, moderately critical study in 140 pages. PACE shows that there was no single idea of God in all Israel. The prophetic idea reached its highest form in second Is., then the legalistic reaction set in. PFEIFFER traces the paramount issue in the O.T. ROTHSTEIN, systematic treatment, opposes Delitzsch. SEEGER studies the evolution of the selfish motive and the religious motive in popular religion. SELLIN, summary of recent excavations. WENSINCK shows that for the common people religion meant cult. Ritual was the means of communication between man and God. Cf. also Causse 807 and C. R. Smith 1738 which contain much biblical theology and Montefiori 1692a.

b) The Problem of Evil

- 1542. E. Balla. *Das Problem des Leides in der Geschichte der israelitisch-jüdischen Religion*. Gunkels Eucharisterion, 214-60.
- 1543. L. W. Batten. *Good and Evil*. 1918, pp. 224. Rev. Calkins, HTR 12, 472-4; Mercer, ATR 1, 435-6.
- 1544. P. Humbert. *L'Ancient Testament et le problème de la souffrance*. Lausanne, 1918, pp. 51. Rev. Lods, RHR 78, 276-7.
- 1545. — *The O.T. and the Problem of Suffering*. BW 52, 115-35.

BALLA and BATTEN, evolution of idea. HUMBERT shows the sovereign efficiency of vicarious suffering and the nothingness of suffering when compared to blissful communion with God.

c) Eschatology

1546. S. S. Cohon. *The Origin of Death*. Journal of Jew. Lore a. Phil. 1, 371-96.
1547. W. Eichrodt. *Die Hoffnung des ewigen Friedens im alten Israel*. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1920, pp. 147. Rev. Hempel, TLB 42, 100-1; Synave, RSPT 11, 149-51.
1548. H. H. Gowen. *The eschatology of the O.T.* ATR 2, 195-208. Rev. J. Lindsay, JRAS, 1922, 125.
1549. K. Kohler. *Heaven and Hell in Comparative Religion*. New York, Macmillan, 1923, pp. 59-80 and 112-27. Rev. Maynard, ATR 7, 97.
- 1549a. G. Lefebvre. *Égyptiens et Hébreux*. RB, 1922, 481-8.
- 1549b. D. S. Margoliouth. *Arguments from the Pentateuch for the future life*. Exp., 1920, XX, 104-14.
1550. S. A. B. Mercer. *The Destiny of the Righteous in Israel*. ATR 4, 185-91.
1551. W. O. E. Oesterley. *Immortality and the Unseen World*. London, SPCK, 1921, pp. 241. Rev. S. A. Cook, JThS 23, 330-1.
- 1551a. W. Otto. *Die Manen, oder: Von den Urformen des Totenglaubens*. 1923, pp. 96. Rev. Schubert, OLZ 27, 13-4.
- 1551b. L. B. Paton. *Spiritism and the Cult of the Dead in Antiquity*. 1921. Rev. Mercer, JSOR 6, 155-6.
1552. J. Scheftelowitz. *Der Seelen- und Unsterblichkeitsglaube im A. T.* Arch. f. Rel. Wiss. 19, 210-32.
1553. N. Schmidt. *The Origin of Jewish Eschatology*. JBL 41, 102-14.
1554. A. Schulz. *Der Sinn des Todes im A. T.* Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen a. d. Akad. zu Braunsberg im Sommerhalbjahr, 1919, 1-41. Cf. F. Stummer, Theol. Rev. 18, 433 f.
1555. E. Sellin. *Die alttestamentliche Hoffnung auf Auferstehung und ewiges Leben*. NKZ 30, 232-56 and 257-89.
- 1555a. A. C. Welch. *Hebrew and Apocalyptic Conceptions in Immortality*. Edited by Sir James Marchant. London, Putnam. Cf. ET 35, 483-4.
1556. I. F. Wood. *State of the Dead (Hebrew)*. ERE 11, 841-3.

COHON studies the development from Gen. to Pseudepigr. EICHRODT from the Blessing of Jacob to Jeremiah shows that the hope for peace developed in time of distress. GOWEN stresses the non-Hebrew background and the evolution of the doctrine from ethnic religion to the glory of the Kingdom. KOHLER, summary of belief in Apocalyptic and rabbinic literatures. LEFEBVRE says that belief in life after death was borrowed from Egypt after captivity. MARGOLIOUTH shows that belief in survival after death of the patriarchs is based on sound Jewish interpretation of the Pentateuch. MERCER makes a good study of Sheol. OESTERLEY shows the cleavage between popular and prophetic teaching. SCHEFTELOWITZ thinks that the Hebrews always believed in after life. Judg. 5, 20 shows that the souls of the godly went to the stars. Sheol was perpetual for the ungodly. SCHMIDT stresses importance of early yahwist concept and warns against making too much of foreign influence. SELLIN, semi-popular study of development of belief in resurrection and after life. Cf. also Albright 1557, Bornhäuser 1659.

d) Yahwism

- 1557. W. F. Albright. *The Mouth of the Rivers*. AJSL 35, 161-95.
- 1558. — *The Babylonian Temple Tower and the altar of burnt offering*. JBL 39, 137-42.
- 1558a. — *The Name Yahweh*. JBL 43, 370-78.
- 1558b. — *The Evolution of the West-Semitic Divinity 'Anat-'Attâ*. AJSL 41, 73-101.
- 1559. W. R. Arnold. *Ephod and Ark*. Harvard University Press, 1918, pp. 170. Rev. Paton, AJTh 23, 220-5.
- 1560. H. J. D. Astley. *Survivals of primitive cults in the O. T.*, Int. 15, 90-7 and 206-15.
- 1561. G. A. Barton. *Poles and Posts (Canaanites and Hebrews)*. ERE 10, 94.
- 1562. — *Possession (Israel)*. ERE 10, 134-5.
- 1562a. K. Beth. *Noch einiges zum ägyptischen Neter*. ZAW 38, 87-104.
- 1563. D. P. Blair. *Stone altars and Cup Marks in South Palestine*. PEFQS, 1919, 167-74.
- 1564. K. Budde. *Ephod und Lade*. ZAW 39, 1-42.

1565. E. Busse. *Der Wein im Kult des A. T.* 1922, pp. 70. Rev. Löhr, OLZ 26, 327-8; Synave; RSPT 13, 99-100.
1567. T. Canaan. *Haunted Springs and Water Demons in Palestine.* JPOS 1, 153-70.
1568. M. A. Canney. *The goat song.* ZAW 42, 145-8.
1569. — *Shaddai.* ET 34, 332.
1570. — *Sky folk in the O. T.* Journ. of Manchester E. a. Or. Stud. 10, 1923, 53-8.
1571. W. Caspari. *Die Gottesgemeinde vom Sinaj und das nachmalige Volk Israel.* Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1922, pp. 172. Rev. Meinhold, TLZ 48, 296-7.
1572. J. B. Chabot. *Dédicaces carthagoises. Un nouveau fragment du tarif rituel.* JA, 1921, I, 177-84.
- 1572a. Clermont-Ganneau. *Le conseil des Trente à Carthage.* Journ. des Savants, 1921, 223-9.
- 1572b. J. de Groot. *Israëlitische Regenceremonieën.* TT, 1918, 38-51.
1574. L. Desnoyers. *La religion sous les trois premiers rois d'Israël.* BLE, 1924, 186-209.
1575. J. Döllner. *Der Wein in Bibel und Talmud.* Bibl. 4, 143-67 and 267-99.
1576. — *Die Wahrsagerei im A. T.* Pp. 56. Rev. Synave, RSPT 13, 96.
1577. R. P. Dougherty. *The Shirkutu of Babylonian Deities.* Yale University Press, 1923, pp. 93.
1578. R. Dussaud. *Les origines cananéennes du sacrifice israélite.* Paris, Leroux, 1921, pp. 334. Rev. (anon.), RB, 1922, 466-8; Baumgartner, TLZ 48, 221-3; Casanowicz, JQR 14, 354-5; Gressmann, OLZ 25, 455-8; M. Lambert, REJ 74, 107-10; Lods, RHPR 3, 79-82; Van Gennep, Merc. de France 610 (1923) 218. Cf. Loisy 1604.
1579. — *Byblos et la mention des Giblytes dans l'A. T.* Syria 4, 300-15.
1580. O. Eissfeldt. *Erstlinge und Zehnten im A. T.* 1917. Rev. Löhr, OLZ, 1918, 49-50.
1581. H. J. Elhorst. *Die deuteromischen Jahresfeste.* ZAW 42, 136-45.
1582. M. H. Farbridge. *Studies in Biblical and Semitic Symbolism.* London, Kegan, 1923, pp. 303.
1583. S. Feigin. *The Meaning of Ariel.* JBL 39, 131-7.

1584. F. Feldermann. *Israels Religion, Sitte und Kultur in der vormossaischen Zeit*. Münster, Aschendorff, 1917, pp. 48.
1585. J. G. Frazer. *Adonis, Étude de religions orientales comparées*. Paris, Geuthner, 1921, pp. 319. Rev. (anon.), RB, 1922, 464-6; Synave, RSPT 11, 471-4.
1586. — *Folklore in the O.T. Studies in Comparative Religion, Legend, and Law*. Macmillan, 3 vols., pp. 594, 592, 574; 1918. Reimpression, 1919. One volume edition, 1923, pp. 506. Rev. (anon.) Exp., 1924, I, 61-3; Canney, Int. 15, 173-4; Cosgrave, ATR 6, 326-7; Dussaud, RHR 79, 376-84; Fernandez, Bibl. 2, 382-4; Fullerton, AJTh 24, 137-43; Headlam, CQR 88, 139-44; Loisy, RC 86, 342-6; R. C. Temple, JRAS, 1919, 65-76; Van Gennep, Merc. de France 622, 195; Vincent, RB, 154-6. Cf. Gowen 1589, Martingale 1606, Meunier 1610.
1587. A. H. Godbey. *Ancient Hebrew Science*. Meth. Quart. Rev., 1923, 139-63.
1588. — *Blood Marriage Contracts*. 481-91.
1589. H. H. Gowen. *The Folklore of the O.T.* ATR 3, 310-27. Rev. J. Lindsay, JRAS, 1922, 125.
1590. E. Grant. *The people of Palestine*. 1921, pp. 271. Rev. Mercer, JSOR 6, 40.
1591. — *Oracle in the O.T.* AJSL 39, 257-81.
- 1591a. H. Grapow. *Zu dem Aufsatz von Prof. Beth, El und Neter*. ZAW 37, 199-208.
- 1591b. H. Gressmann. Cf. 1593a.
1592. H. Grimme. *Ephodenscheid und Prophetenrede*. MVAG, 1917, II, 316-27.
1593. P. Haupt. *Heb. qēṭort and Gr. nektar*. AJPh 43, 245-7.
- 1593a. G. Hoffmann und H. Gressmann. *Teraphim, Masken und Winkorakel in Ägypten und Vorderasien*. ZAW 40, 75-137.
1594. H. Holma. *Zum Marseiller Opfertarif z. 20*. OLZ 24, 155.
1595. B. Jacob. *The Decalogue*. JQR 14, 141-88.
1596. J. A. Jaussen. *La fête de Saint Elie au Mont Carmel*. RB 33, 249-59.
- 1596a. — *Le mauvais œil*. RB 33, 396-407.
1597. A. Jirku. *Der Ba'al Lebanon in den Keilschrifturkunden von Boghazköy*. OLZ 26, 4-5.

1598. A. Jirku. *Zur magischen Bedeutung der Kleidung in Israel*. ZAW 37, 109 ff.
- 1598a. P. Joüon. בליעל. Bibl. 5, 178-83.
- 1598b. J. A. Kelso. *The water libation in the O.T.* Exp. 24, 226-40.
1599. R. H. Kennett. *Place of sacrifice in the Church of Israel*. Int. 16, 251-63.
1600. E. König. *Die sogenannte Volksreligion Israels*. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1921, pp. 51. Rev. Caspari, TLB 42, 227.
- 1600a. — *Das jetzt brennende Problem der A. T. Religionsgeschichte*. NKZ 31, 298-312.
- 1600b. — *The burning problem of the hour in O.T. Religious History*. Exp., 1921, 21, 81-106.
1601. — *The so-called "Popular religion of Israel."* Exp., 1922, 23, 383-419.
- 1601a. — *Ist Jahwe im A. T. irgendwo als Untergott gemeint?* ZAW 40, 68-74.
1602. K. Kohler. *The tetragrammaton (Shem ham-m'forash) and its uses*. Journ. of Jew. Lore a. Phil. 1, 19-32.
1603. M. Lichtenstein. *Das Wort נשׂא in der Bibel*. 1920, pp. 160. Rev. Caspari, TLB 42, 22-3; Löhr, OLZ 24, 261-2, Synave, RSPT 11, 147.
1604. A. Loisy. *Sacrifices Cananéens et Sacrifices Israélites*. RHLR 8, 338-69.
- 1604a. D. D. Luckenbill. *The pronunciation of the name of God in Israel*. AJSL 40, 277-83.
1605. R. A. S. Macalister. *Sacrifice (Semitic)*. ERE 11, 31-8.
1606. C. C. Martindale. *The Bible and Magic*. Dublin Review 167, 89-93.
1607. E. W. G. Masterman. *A Jewish Feast*. PEFQS, 1919, 112-7.
1608. — *Saints and Martyrs (Syrian)*. ERE 11, 78-82.
1609. A. Medebielle. *Le symbolisme du sacrifice expiatoire en Israël*. Bibl. 2, 141-69; 273-302.
1610. R. Meunier. *La Bible et la Sociologie comparée*. Scientia, vol. 27, S. II, 1920, p. 474 ff.
- 1610a. J. Morgenstern. *The historical reconstruction of Hebrew Religion and Archaeology*. JR 1, 233-54.
1611. C. Niebuhr. *Gilgal als entwicklungsgeschichtliches Problem*. OLZ 23, 105-11.

1612. D. Nielsen. *Der dreieinige Gott in religionhistorischer Beleuchtung. I. Die drei göttlichen Personen.* 1922, pp. 487. Rev. König, TLB 43, 231-3; Maynard, ATR 7, 385-6; Synave, RSPT 12, 385-7; Weinell, OLZ 26, 50-4.
1613. W. O. E. Oesterley. *The sacred dance.* New York, Macmillan, 1923, pp. 245. Cf. ET 35, 3-6.
1614. J. Offord. *The mountain throne of Yahweh.* PEF, 1919, 39-45.
1615. G. Orfali. *De arca foederis.* Paris, Picard, 1918, pp. 119. Rev. Kissane, IQR 13, 357-9; Lagrange, RB, 1919, 588-9; Touzard, Rev. de l'Orient Chr. 21, 107-8.
- 1615a. R. Pettazzoni. *La formation du monothéisme.* RHR, 1923, reprint pp. 37.
1616. R. H. Pfeiffer. *Cherubim.* JBL 41, 249-50.
1617. E. J. Pilcher. *The covenant ceremony among the Hebrews.* PSBA, 1918, 8-14.
1618. J. Plessis. *Étude sur les textes concernant Ishtar-Astarté.* Paris, Geuthner, 1921. Rev. Dhorme, RB 32, 476-7; Dussaud, RHR, 1923, 123-8; Synave, RSPT 11, 463-5; Vincent, Rev. de SR 3, 395-7.
1619. M. Radin. *The kid and its mother's milk.* AJSL 40, 209-18.
- 1619a. A. H. Sayce. *The scape goat among the Hittites.* ET 31, 283-4.
1620. P. Saintyves. *Essais de folklore biblique, Magie, Mythes, et Miracles dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament.* Paris, Nourry, 1922, pp. 500. Rev. v. Eysinga, NTT 12, 218-20; P. L. Faye, Americ. Anthropol. 25, 421-2; Gowen, ATR 7, 381-3.
1621. P. Salmen. *Il culto degli spiriti e i sacrifici nella Transgiordania.* Riv. int. d. Sc. Soc., 1921. Cf. Bil. 17, 418-9.
1622. H. Schmidt. *Kerubenthron und Lade.* Gunkels Eucharisterion, 120-44.
1623. E. Sellin. *Mose und seine Bedeutung für israelitische-jüdische Religionsgeschichte.* 1922. Rev. Proksch, TLB 45, 69-70; Sellin, Theol. d. Geg. 17, 126-8; Stummer, OLZ 27, 83-4.
1624. Sarah A. Tooley. *Psychic phenomena in the O. T.* London, Philpot, 1922, pp. 87. Rev. Canney, Int. 19, 75-6.
1625. H. Torczyner. *Die Bundeslade und die Anfänge der Religion Israels.* 1922. Rev. Sellin, Theol. d. Geg. 17, 128-30.

1626. E. Vasscl. *Les animaux exceptionnels des stèles de Carthage*. RHR 84, 36-76.
- 1626a. — *Moloch et le grand couple divin des Carthaginods*. RTun, 1923, 88 ff.
1627. L. Venetianer. *Elohim*. ZAW 40, 157-60.
1628. D. Völter. *Die Herkunft Jahwes*. ZAW 37, 128-33.
1629. A. J. Wensinck. *Some Semitic rites of mourning and religion*. Amsterdam, 1917. Rev. Hirschfeld, JRAS, 1919, 253-8.
1630. — *Tree and bird as cosmological symbols in Western Asia*. 1921, pp. 60. Rev. Gaster, JRAS, 1921, 663-4.
1631. — *The Ocean in the literature of the Western Semites*. 1918, pp. 66. Rev. R. Basset, RHR 84, 168-9; Langdon, JRAS, 1919, 281-2.
1632. V. Zapletal. *Der Wein in der Bibel. Kulturgeschichte und exegetische Studie*. Freiburg, Herder, 1920, pp. 80. Rev. Ginsburger, REJ 72, 109; Vincent, RB, 1921, 150; Synave, RSPT 10, 121 ff.

ALBRIGHT 1557 on the Elysian fields of the Semites. ALBRIGHT 1558 on Feigin 1583 says that the Mountain of the Gods and that of the shades were distinct at first. ALBRIGHT 1558a, compares with Egyptian and translates the form as a hiphil of *to be*. ALBRIGHT 1558b, on the Old Semitic goddess and her survival. ARNOLD does not believe that there was a solid ephod. There the text should be emended and read "ark." ASTLEY finds mystic cults in Ez. 8, Dt. 4, and Is. 65 and 66. BETH *versus* GRAPOW 1591a maintains that Elohim as a god par excellence is parallel to Neter. BLAIR illustrates his article with drawings. BUDDE *versus* ARNOLD 1559. BUSSE is not very clear on the evolution of the use of wine. CANAAN on the jinn of to-day. CANNEY 1568 finds early goat worship among the Semites. Poetry was goat song. Barley was goat-stuff. CANNEY 1569, Shaddai was a goddess of fertility. CANNEY 1570 on the real nature of the mal'akhim. CASPARI traces a growth of the El-Religion in Yahwism and says that the Covenant is not really an alliance but ruling by Yahwe. CHABOT and CLERMONT-GANNEAU study a new fragment of the Carthaginian ritual tariff. DE GROOT compares with Arabian and modern Palestinian rites. DESNOYERS writes an excellent survey of old prophetism of the nabis. DÖLLER, culture, manufacture, use of wine. DOUGHERTY shows that there is a class of Babylonian priests and priestesses answering

to the nethinim. DUSSAUD 1578 emphasizes Canaanite influence on Hebrew ritual. DUSSAUD 1578 shows that Adonis was at first a forest god represented by a pole. ELHORST tests Hölscher's theory of D and Josiah's passover. FARBRIDGE, a good, but often uncritical collection of material lending itself to symbolism. FEIGIN finds four meanings, hero, altar, place of sacrifice, and image of god. He connects it with worship of the dead. FELDMANN surveys patriarchal religion. FRAZER 1585 in French translation with some revision; a good study of Canaanite religion, of sacred poles and stones, but also much that is romantic guess work. FRAZER 1586, a series of collections of rites similar to certain features of Hebrew religion, written in the incomparable style of the *Golden Bough*, with the same artistic, and not necessarily accurate point of view. GODBEY 1587 shows limitations of Semitic and Hebrew scholarship and its bearing on religious conceptions. GODBEY 1588, an excellent criticism of W. R. Smith's Sacramentarian view of sacrifice and a study of sacrifice at Semitic weddings. GOWEN on FRAZER 1586, GRANT 1590, enlarged edition of his *Peasantry of Palestine*. GRANT 1591 studies various ways to learn Yahweh's mind. GRAPOW opposes Beth's thesis in ZAW 36, 129-86. GRIMME on the means of divination. HAUPT shows that fat as the food of the Gods went into smoke which the Gods drank. HOFFMANN thinks that Moses wore a ritual mask and makes a thorough study of the teraphim. JACOB shows (pp. 154-66) that the sabbath has nothing to do with the moon and that it is not Babylonian, but that the meaning of is "fulness." JAUSSEN 1596 describes religious survivals in the festival of Saint Elijah especially the hair-offering and fertility rites. JAUSSEN 1596a on Palestinian belief in the evil eye. JIRKU finds the Baal of Lebanon in KBo I and studies the magical meaning of clothing. JOÜON explains as a compound of the negation *beli* and *ya'al* whose meaning is not certain. It is not abstract but concrete and became a proper name. KELSO shows that the rite at first animistic became one of penance. KENNETT finds that sacrifice was based on fear. KÖNIG claims that the "popular" religion of Israel was artificially built up by scholars, largely of erroneous material and its value was exaggerated. Yahwe was never a subordinate God (1601a). The question of the religion of the patriarchs is a burning one (1600ab). KOHLER declares the Kenite theory absurd. Yahweh was a storm deity. The avoidance

of his name is exilic. LICHTENSTEIN finds that *nefes* is in relation with blood and means life, before J and E. In J, E and prophets before Jeremiah it means passion, as a vital force of the body. After Jeremiah it means person. LOISY reviews DUSSAUD 1578, criticizes his theory of sacrifice and his identification of Hebrew sacrifice with those in Marseilles tariff. One might perhaps compare Phoenician with pre-exilic sacrifices, not with the post-exilic system. LUCKENBILL finds that the form was Yahu or Yah. The testimony of the Mesa stone was misunderstood. The form Yahweh is not authentic. The older form may have been Yahaun. MARTINDALE, a clever criticism of Frazer, pointing inaccuracies. MASTERMAN 1607 describes the annual festival at the tomb of Rabbi Simeon ben Yokhai. MEDEBIELLE sees in the sacrifice a present and an homage to God. Blood is the soul itself; one expiates by a mystical substitution signified by the *semikah*. There is no worship of the departed (pp. 145-7), no totemism (pp. 148-51). MEEK says that Yahweh was originally a tribal God of Judah. The Levites were his missionaries. The prophets developed away from the priesthood. MEUNIER on FRAZER 1586. MORGENSTERN says that Yahweh was not a volcanic god. He contrasts nomadic and Canaanite culture and shows that certain rites have been preserved in Talmud. NIEBUHR on the Sanctuary of Gilgal, based on Sellin. NIELSEN emphasizes importance of South Arabian religion for an understanding of Hebraism. OESTERLEY, comparative study, especially good in Hebrew religious dancing. OFFORD shows again that Yahweh was a mountain deity. ORFALI illustrates the ark with parallels. PETTAZZONI shows that Yahweh was a sky god. PFEIFFER compares the cherubim with the Assyrian *kuribu*. PILCHER studies the covenant rite of passing between the victims. PLESSIS makes an exhaustive study of the worship of the Goddess. RADIN finds as allusion to a Dioysiac rite. SAINTYVES, comparative method. SALMEN on survivals. SAYCE finds the scapegoat in an unpublished Hittite text. SCHMIDT compares with some well known Assyro-Babylonian reliefs. SELLIN shows influence of Moses. TOOLEY on "spiritualist" manifestations. TORCZYNER studies the ark. He explains Yahweh as the "roarer" (Wahwah). VASSEL 1626 important data on Carthaginian religion. VASSEL 1626a says that Molok is MLK with the vowels of Toebah. Calls attention to the discovery of a tophet at Carthage. There, the names of Tamt

and Baalhammon were tabu like Yhwh. VENETIANER, a fanciful derivation from *ilu I M*. VÖLTER compares Yahweh with Sopd, god of the wilderness and the form of the name itself to Khepera. WENSINCK 1630 connects with sun worship. WENSINCK 1631 on the fountain of life. ZAPLETAL, a good study of viticulture and of the ritual use of wine at the passover. Cf. also Baldensperger 503 on modern feasts and processions; Vernes 792 for Urim and Thummim; Scheftelowicz 592 on the sacrifice of the red cone; Thackeray 132 on the evolution of festivals from their pagan origins; Flight 1720 on nomadic religion; Elhorst 602, 603; Leidecker 399; Hölscher 646a on sacred prostitution; Bruston 745 on Boaz as a name of Yahweh; MAYNARD 718 on Belial.

e) Prophetism

- 1637. H. C. Ackerman. *The principle of differentiation between "the word of the Lord" and "the angel of the Lord."* AJSL 37, 145-9.
- 1638. W. W. Graf Baudissin. *Zur Entwicklung des Gebrauchs von 'Ebed in religiösem Sinne*. Budde, Festschrift, pp. 1-9.
- 1639. G. Heinisch. *Das „Wort“ im A. T. und im alten Orient*. Münster, Aschendorff, 1922, pp. 52.
- 1640. R. H. Kennett. *The conflict between priestly and prophetic ideas in the Church of Israel*. Int. 14, 104-15.
- 1641. E. König. *Die messianischen Weissagungen des A. T.* Stuttgart, 1923, pp. 374. Rev. Staerk, OLZ 27, 31-2.
- 1642. C. Lattey. *Ruler worship in the Bible*. Ir. Quart. Rev. 14, 238-57.
- 1642a. W. F. Lofthouse. *"Thus hath Jahveh said."* AJSL 40, 231-51.
- 1643. J. M. P. Smith. *Southern influence upon Hebrew prophecy*. AJSL 35, 1-19.
- 1644. — *Traces of Emperor-Worship in the O. T.* AJSL 39, 32-9.
- 1645. J. Szeruda. *Das Wort Jahwes. Eine Untersuchung zur israelitisch-jüdischen Religionsgeschichte*. Lodz, Manitius, 1921, pp. 95. Rev. Aeschimann, RHPR 3, 387-8; Proksch, TLB 45, 54-5; Synave, RSPT 11, 144-5.
- 1646. A. Vaccari. *Babilonismo e Messianismo*. La Scuola Cattolica, 1922, 403-22.

ACKERMAN differentiates the angels as phenomenal beings from the word which is noumenal. BAUDISSIN shows that in religious sense the word meant pious man before D, and after Ezekiel, the people of Israel. HEINISCH compares with the word in Babylonian hymns. KENNETT says that D ignores sacrifice. The bulk of the nation was Canaanite. Josiah's reform was a necessary compromise. KÖNIG, a thorough study of messianism, completing 1521. LATTEY studies ruler worship in Daniel 6 and Wisdom 14, 16-7. LOFTHOUSE shows that prophets differed from mystics and ecstasies. SMITH 1643 studies Egyptian parallels and religion in the South. SMITH 1644 finds traces of ruler worship in messianism. SZERUDA finds three aspects of the word, instrument of revelation, cosmico-physical power, divine hypostasis. VACCARI studies the astronomical aspect of messianism in Babl. and contrasts with true messianism. For a complete survey of prophetic religion one should also refer to the section on prophecy (general) (Nos. 800 to 1081) and especially Hänel 813, Hertzberg 815, and Marti 831.

f) The Iranian Influence

- 1650. A. Carnoy. *L'idée du « Royaume du Dieu » dans l'Iran*. Museon 34, 81-106.
- 1651. G. W. Carter. *Zoroastrianism and Judaism*. Boston, Badger, 1918.
- 1652. J. Scheftelowitz. *Die altpersische Religion und das Judentum*. Gießen, Topelmann, 1920, pp. 250. Rev. (anon.), RB 32, 151 ff.; Strack, TLB 43, 337-8.

CARNOY says that the "Kingdom" is a Zoroastrian adaptation of the indo-iranian Kshatra of Asura-Varuna. Lagrange would therefore be wrong in believing that the "Kingdom" idea is older than Zoroastrianism. CARTER's book has little scholarly value. SCHEFTELOWITZ is not very thorough. He stresses the independent evolution and still finds in second Isaiah a polemic against Persian dualism. Cf. also Göttberger 1697.

g) Early Judaism

- 1655. I. Abrahams. *Symbolism (Jewish)*. ERE 12, 143-4.
- 1656. — *Sects (Jewish)*. ERE 11, 332.
- 1657. — *Sanhedrin*. ERE 11, 184-5.
- 1658. S. Angus. *Zealots*. ERE 11, 849-55.

- 1658a. G. Batault. *L'exclusivisme juif*. Merc. de France 146, 18-54.
 1658b. — *Le Judaïsme et l'esprit de révolte*. Ibid. 146, 622-63.
 1658c. P. Billerbeck. Cf. Strack 1703.
 1659. K. Bornhäuser. *Die Gebeine der Toten. Ein Beitrag zu dem Verständnis der Anschauungen von der Totenauferstehung zur Zeit des N. T.* Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1921, pp. 58. Rev. Laible, TLB 43, 321-8.
 1660. W. Bousset. *Der verborgene Heilige*. Arch. f. Rel. Wiss. 21, 1-17.
 1661. G. K. Box. *Scribes and Sadducees in the N. T.* Exp., 1918, XV, 401-11; XVI, 55-69.
 1662. — *Who were the Sadducees*. Exp., 1918, XV, 19-38.
 1663. — *Sadducees*. ERE 11, 43-6.
 1664. A. Büchler. *Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety*. London, Jewish College Publication No. 8, 1922.
 1665. F. C. Burkitt. *Memra, Shekinah, Metatron*. JQR 24, 158-9.
 1666. A. Causse. *La propagande juive et l'hellénisme*. RHPR 3, 397-414.
 1667. L. Cerfaux. *Influence des mystères sur le Judaïsme alexandrin avant Philon*. Museon 34, 29-88. Rev. L(agrangé), RB 34, 150-2.
 1669. A. Duff. *The rise of the title Messiah*. Exp., 1923, XXIV, 205-15.
 1670. B. S. Easton. *Self-baptism*. AJTh 24, 513-8.
 1671. — *Jewish and Early Christian ordination*. ATR V, 308-19; VI, 285-95.
 1671a. — *A valuation of Hastings ERE (O. T. and Judaism)*. JR 3, 68-70.
 1672. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake. *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Vol. I, Prolegomena I. *The Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Background*. London, Macmillan, 1920, pp. 491. Rev. Zeitlin, JQR 14, 118-32. Cf. Montefiore 1692 and Moore 1697, 1698.
 1673. M. Gaster. *Sacrifice (Jewish)*. ERE 11, 24-9.
 1674. — *Transmigration (Jewish)*. ERE 12, 435-40.
 1675. L. Ginsberg. *The religion of the Jews at the time of Jesus*. Hebrew Union Coll. An., 1924, 307-21.
 1676. M. G. Glazebrook. *Hebrew Conceptions of Atonement and their influence upon early Christian doctrine*. JTS 20, 109-20.

1677. J. Göttberger. *Die göttliche Weisheit als Persönlichkeit im A. T.* Münster, Aschendorff, 1919, pp. 79. Rev. Staerk, TLZ 45, 292; Synave, RSPT 10, 115-6.
1678. R. T. Herford. *The fundamentals of Religion, as interpreted by Christianity and Rabbinical Judaism.* HJ 21, 314-26.
- 1678a. — *The Pharisees.* New York, Macmillan, 1924, pp. 248.
- 1678b. H. Hirschfeld. *Priest, priesthood (Jewish).* ERE 10, 323-5.
1679. H. Höpfl. *Das Chanukafest.* Bibl. 3, 165-79.
1680. M. D. Hussey. *Origin of the name Pharisee.* JBL 39, 66-9.
1681. S. Israel. *Intorno all'origine della Setta dei Sadducei.* Religio II, 1-22.
1682. K. Kohler. *Jewish theology systematically and historically considered.* New York, Macmillan, 1918, pp. 518. Rev. Barnes, JTS 20, 184-5.
1683. — *Shema Yisroel. Origin and Purpose of its daily Recital.* Journ. of Jew. Lor. a. Phil. 1, 255-64.
- 1683a. K. Lake. Cf. 1672.
- 1683b. A. Lemonnyer. *La déesse Anath d'Élephantine.* RSPT 9, 581-8.
1684. I. Levi. *Le ravissement du Messie à sa naissance.* REJ, 1922, 113-26.
1685. H. M. J. Loewe. *Worship (Jewish).* ERE 12, 804-7.
1686. J. E. McFadyen. *The spirit of early Judaism.* ET 32, 228-31; 277-80; 312-16.
1687. D. S. Margoliouth. *The Messiah.* Exp., 1923, XXIV, 1-21. Cf. Duff 1669 and Mozley 1700.
1688. A. Marmorstein. *The doctrine of merits in old Rabbinical Literature.* 1920. Rev. Cook, JTS 23, 332-3.
1689. — *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte.* TT, 1918, 92-122.
1690. E. Meyer. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums.* Stuttgart, Gott'sche Buchh. Rev. Zeitlin, JQR 14, 111-18.
1691. A. N. Modona. *La vita pubblica e privata degli Ebrei in Egitto nell'età ellenistica e romana.* Florence, 1922.
1692. C. G. Montefiore. *The spirit of Judaism.* In Foakes-Jackson-Lake 1672, pp. 35-81.
- 1692a. — *The O. T. and after.* London, Macmillan, 1923, pp. 612. Rev. Barnes, JTS 25, 439-41. Cf. also ET 34, 494.
1693. J. A. Montgomery. *The religion of Flavius Josephus.* JQR 11, 277-305.

1694. G. F. Moore. *Christian writers on Judaism*. HTR 14, 197-254.
 1695. — *Intermediaries in Jewish Theology, Memra, Shekinah, Metetron*. HTR 15, 41-85.
 1696. — *Recent books on Judaism*. HTR 16, 104-8.
 1697. — *The rise of normative Judaism, I. To the reorganization at Jammia*. HTR 17, 307-73.
 1698. — *Nazarene and Nazareth*. Pp. 426-32.
 1700. A. D. Mozley. *Jewish Expectations as to the Date of Christ's coming*. Exp., 1923, XXIV, 238-40.
 1701. J. P. Naish. *The Semitic Background of the Gospels*. Int. 19, 289-97.
 1701a. E. J. Pilcher. *A Samaritan Periapt*. JRAS, 1920, 343-6.
 1702. J. J. Price. *Shekinah*. ERE 11, 450-2.
 1703. H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum N. T. aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 2 vol., 1922, 1924, pp. 1063.
 1703a. M. Weber. *Das antike Judentum*. Pp. 449. Rev. Meinhold, DLZ, 1922, 720-6.
 1704. I. F. Wood. *A Samaritan Passover Manuscript*. JBL 40, 159-61.

This section of our bibliography partly covers other fields of study (N. T. and Judaism) and cannot therefore be complete. BORNHÄUSER deals with pharisaism and the resurrection. BOUSSET gives many instances of Christian and Jewish saints who disappear as soon as their greatness is discovered. Box 1662 *versus* Segal in Exp., Feb. 1917. BÜCHLER, on pious men between 70 B.C. and 70 A.D. BURKITT endorses Moore 1695. CAUSSE shows the philanthropic transformation of Yahweh in Sybilline Or. and Wisdom Lit. CERFAUX traces influence of Egyptian mysteries especially in mystic doctrine, mystic names, and the new mystic character of Abraham and Moses. DALMAN on Judaism in time of Christ. DUFF on MARGOLIOUTH 1687 would call attention to the Psalms of Solomon especially to Ps. 17. EASTON 1670 on self-baptism of proselytes. EASTON 1671 on the organization of synagogue officials. FOAKES-JACKSON and LAKE study varieties of thought and practice in Judaism (pp. 82-136), the dispersion (pp. 137-68), the zealots (pp. 421-5), the Slavonic Josephus (pp. 433-5), and the differences in legal interpretation between the Pharisees and Sadducees (pp. 436-8). The work is of fundamental value. GINSBERG thinks that the importance of apocalyptic literature should not be

overstressed but should be considered only as part of the Jewish literature as a whole. GLAZEBROOK finds in N. T. three inconsistent views of the atonement, all derived from the O. T. plus the mystical views of Paul and John. GÖTTSEBERGER finds no Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, or Greek influence in the development of Wisdom as a personality. There is a human tendency to hypostatize divine attributes which worked in Israel, when polytheism gave way before monotheism. HERFORD finds that in both systems religion is an effective desire on the part of man to be right with God, on the basis of the same fundamental facts. HÖPFL on the origin and historical development of Chanukah. Miss HUSSEY finds that pharisaism began as a name of opprobrium. KOHLER 1682 is an excellent textbook showing real knowledge of pseudographs as well as of biblical and rabbinical literature. KOHLER 1683 takes issue with Moore's statement that there were various forms of local Yahweh (Hist. of Rel. II, 23) and shows that the emphasis of the *Shema* was the stroke of true religious genius. LEMONNYER thinks that worship of Anath was brought into Egypt by the Hyksos. She had no real connection with Yahweh worship. LEVI shows that the talmudic story of the ravishing of the Messiah, which is at the basis of Rev. 12, is a popular deformation of a fragment of apocalypse where the Jewish community is a mother. McFADYEN contrasts post-exilic with pre-exilic ages in the matter of attitude towards world order, future life, wisdom. MARGOLIOUTH thinks that there is no real messianism before the Christian era, not even in Josephus. The high priest was the Messiah. MARMORSTEIN 1688, an exhaustive study. This vicarious solidarity was even international and cosmic. MARMORSTEIN 1689 would make of Schechter's Zadokite document a work of the eleventh century. MEYER, a thorough study of history and religion between Persian times and Christ. MONTEFIORE thinks that Jews were full of zeal to make proselytes. MOORE 1694 surveys from early church times the Christian writers on Judaism, and gives an excellent criticism of Schürer, Weiss and Bousset. MOORE 1695 clears up many common Christian misconceptions. Memra and Shekinah have only at times a semblance of personality. Metetron is not a mediator. MOORE 1696 studies Bäck's 2nd edit. of *Wesen des Judentums* and Strack 1703, first vol. MOORE 1697 warns on critical aberration on P. MONTEFIORE 1692a, an excellent study of religious values.

MOZLEY on MARGOLIOUTH 1687 finds the key to the difficulty in Dan. 9, 24-7, the question of the date of the book having no importance in this matter. NAISH surveys mystic (or pietist), philosophical, and apocalyptic movements in early Judaism. PILCHER studies a bilingual text (Greek and Samaritan) which shows as intense monotheism. STRACK, a thorough study of the Jewish background of Gospel's, of fundamental value. The first part of Weber's work is on Die israelitische Eidgenossenschaft und Jahwe. See also, Thompson 305 on the Samaritans.

h) Ethical and sociological aspects of Hebrew Religion

- 1710. J. Abelson. *Slavery (Jewish)*. ERE 11, 619-21.
- 1711. G. A. Barton. *Suicide (Semitic)*. ERE 12, 38-9.
- 1712. G. Beer. *Die soziale und religiöse Stellung der Frau im israelitischen Altertume*. Tübingen, Mohr, 1919, pp. 47. Rev. Dalman, TLB 41, 66-7; Leipoldt, DLZ, 1922, 148-9; Nowack, TLZ 45, 172; Synave, RSPT 10, 119-20.
- 1713. A. Bertholet. *Kulturgeschichte Israels*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1919, pp. 294. Rev. Causse, RHPR 3, 386-7; Synave, RSPT 10, 103-6.
- 1713a. A. W. F. Blunt. *Israel before Christ. An account of social and religious development in the O.T.* Oxford Univ. Press, 1924, pp. 144. Cf. ET 35, 502.
- 1714. Edna M. Bonser. *How the early Hebrews lived and learned*. Macmillan, 1924, pp. 286.
- 1715. H. J. Cadbury. *National ideals in the O.T.* New York, Scribners, 1920, pp. 283. Rev. Ackerman, ATR 3, 153-4; Allis, PTR 21, 314-6; Mercer, ATR 4, 57; Sweet, BR 5, 625-9.
- 1716. M. E. Cady. *Education in the Bible; principles; practice and product of the Ancient Hebrew system, with applications to the problems of modern education*. Washington, Review and Herald Pub. Ass., 1923.
- 1717. E. Day. *Was the Hebrew monarchy limited?* AJSL 40, 98-110.
- 1718. J. Döllner. *Das Weib im A. T.* Münster, Aschendorff, 1920, pp. 84. Rev. Synave, RSPT 10, 120-1.
- 1719. A. Eberhalter. *Das Ehe- und Familienrecht der Hebräer*. Münster, Aschendorff, 1914. Cf. Anthropos 14/15, 621-3.

1720. J. W. Flight. *The nomadic idea and ideal in the O. T.* JBL 42, 158-226.
1721. Eva Gillichewski. *Der Ausdruck עם הארץ im A. T.* ZAW 40, 137-42.
1722. H. H. Gowen. *Were the Hebrews democratic?* ATR 3, 137-40.
1723. E. N. Haddad. *Blood revenge among the Arabs.* JPOS 1, 103-12.
1724. — *Methods of education and correction among the Fellahin.* JPOS 1, 41-4.
1725. H. W. Hertzberg. *Die Entwicklung des Begriffes משפט im A. T.* ZAW 40, 256-87.
1726. J. A. Margoliouth. *Suicide (Jewish).* ERE 12, 37-8.
1727. J. A. Maynard. *The problem of the formation of character in the light of the history of Hebrew Education.* ATR 3, 228-35.
1728. — *A survey of Hebrew Education.* Milwaukee, Morehouse, 1924, pp. 85. Rev. Lods, RHPR 5, 84-6.
1729. S. A. B. Mercer. *Morals of Israel. Preprophetic Morals.* ATR 1, 24-41; 288-303.
1730. — *Early prophetic morals.* II, 126-40.
1731. — *Late prophetic and priestly morals.* III, 211-27.
1732. E. Merz. *Die Blutrache bei den Israeliten.* 1916. Rev. Caspari, OLZ, 1918, 83-4.
1733. C. J. Montefiore. *The O. T. and its ethical teaching.* HJ 16, 234-50.
1734. G. F. Moore. *The Am Ha Ares (the people of the Land) and the Haberim (associates).* In Foakes-Jackson, *Beginnings of Christianity.* Vol. I (No. 1672), pp. 439-45.
1735. A. S. Peake. *Brotherhood in the O. T.* London, Hodder, 1923, pp. 179. Rev. (anon.), ET 35, 99-101.
1736. M. Safi. *Mariage au N. du Liban.* Anthropos 12/13, 134-43.
1737. H. Schaeffer. *Hebrew tribal economy and the Jubilee.* 1923, pp. 206. Rev. Caspari, OLZ 26, 297-9.
1738. C. R. Smith. *The Bible doctrine of Society in its historical development.* Edinburgh, Clark, 1920, pp. 418. Rev. P. Gardiner-Smith, JTS 22, 290-2; D. E. Thomas, JR 1, 552-4.
1739. — *The Bible doctrine of wealth and work.* Epworth Press, 1924, pp. 282. Rev. ET 35, 295-6.

1740. C. R. Smith. *The Bible and Animals*. ET 35, 89-91.
1741. J. M. P. Smith. *The moral life of the Hebrews*. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1923, pp. 337. Rev. (anon.), ET 34, 495; Ackerman, ATR 7, 75-6; Mercer, JSOR 8, 38-9; H. P. Smith, JR, 1923, 656-7.
1742. M. Sulzberger. *The status of Labor in Ancient Israel*. JQR 13, 245-302; 396-459. Reprint, Philadelphia, 1923, pp. 127. Rev. (anon.), ET 35, 303-4; Mercer, JSOR 8, 221-2; ATR 7, 337.
1743. F. H. Swift. *Education in Ancient Israel*. Chicago, Open court, 1919. Rev. Mercer, ATR 3, 84-5; Grossmann, JQR 13, 521-3.
- 1743a. S. T. Tucker. *The evolution of the democratic element in the O.T.* Toronto, 1923, pp. 60.
1744. M. Weber. *Das antike Judentum. Die Entstehung des jüdischen Pariavolkes*. Cf. 1703a.
1745. W. D. van Wijngaarden. *De sociale positie van de vrouw bij Israel in den voor-en na-exilischen Tijd*. Leiden, 1919. Rev. Löhr, OLZ 23, 271-2; Proksch, TLB 43, 50.

BEER, a popular study showing how Hebrew civilization was essentially masculine. BERTHOLET, development of culture, neglecting much non-biblical material, but better than Benzinger and Nowack. BLUNT, excellent illustrative survey. CADBURY describes the struggle and blending of political and social ideals. DAY shows how the necessity of working in harmony with the sheikhs limited the monarchy. DÖLLER shows that woman's place was rather important before the exile. Her sphere was the home. A good study of marriage, rejecting the matriarchate hypothesis. EBERHALTER also opposes ordinary evolutionary view, without following however the historico-cultural theory. FLIGHT makes a very thorough study of occupations, foods, clothing, shelter, social life, religion. ideals. Miss GILLISCHIEWSKI finds that the *amhaareš* were first, the people of a certain city, then the heathen or people of suspected ritual purity. GOWEN shows that epithet "democratic" has been loosely used. HADDAD 1724 on modern customs. HERTZBERG shows religious ethical development of the concept *mišpat*. MAYNARD 1727 emphasizes abiding value of Hebrew education. MAYNARD 1728 surveys ideals, aims, methods, and results of it. MERCER classifies and appreciates material bearing on ethics. HADDAD 1723 and MERZ

on blood revenge. MOORE maintains current conception of *am ha areš*. PEAKE, John Clifford lectures for 1923. SAFI, ceremonies, and special clothing at weddings in North Lebanon. SCHAEFFER, a thorough study in the line of his previous work. C. R. SMITH 1738 finds five social periods from the Bedouin stage to Christianity. C. R. SMITH 1739 shows also historical development and compares with modern conditions, although no cut and dry solutions may be offered. C. R. SMITH 1740 deals with the Hebrew treatment of animals. J. M. P. SMITH has written an excellent textbook on Hebrew ethics. SULZBERGER's work is thorough, more especially his study of the *ger* (conquered inhabitant), as a great labor force, gradually assimilated. SWIFT, an excellent study of Hebrew education. WIJNGAARDEN makes a good study of marriage customs. Cf. also Bittenweiser 1263a on blood revenge.

THE ANAPHORA OF SAINT JAMES OF SERUG ¹

Translated by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Trinity College, Toronto

THE ANAPHORA OF SAINT JAMES OF SERUG

The introduction

MAY his prayer and his blessings be with us for ever and ever.
Amen.

Arise in the fear of the Lord that ye may receive enlightenment
in your mind and rest in your heart.

The priest shall say

Praise be to thee, O Lord, who in this place didst cause the
One Hundred and Eighteen Orthodox to appear and to be tried.
Let us draw nigh and pray to God, and bear witness before the
fathers who rest in the Orthodox faith. Let us begin with our
Father, the Holy Arch-pope, father of Petros, and with him, Pope,
abba Christadolu.

The intercession

Remember their names; and those whose names are not re-
membered, make the memorial for them. Let, O Lord, their souls
be precious in thy sight. Let the praise of thy name transform
them, even as thy son, in the Virgin's womb, performed thy will.

The deacon shall say

Ye who sit, stand up.

The priest shall say

To thy son, to whom thou hast given thy power and thy
might and thine own being, to him belong the heaven, the earth,
and all its fulness for ever and ever.

¹ MERCER, *Ms. Eth.* 4, 198a—205a.

The deacon shall say

Look to the east.

The priest shall say

To thy son, to whom thou hast given greatness and power,
to him belongs divinity supreme.

The deacon shall say

Let us give heed.

The priest shall say

Thy beloved angels adore—as do our elders, myriads, hosts upon hosts, and every name that is named under heaven and on earth—the hosts of Michael and their divisions, the congregations of Gabriel and their divisions, the cherubim in their majesty, and the seraphim in their holiness, and all the hosts of angels in their glory give praise to God, to whom be glory, praise, and honour.

The deacon shall say

Respond.

The priest shall say

We shall say with them continually,
Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Sabaoth,
The heavens and the earth are wholly full of the
holiness of thy glory.

The priest shall say

Holy, holy, holy is he who in truth is our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. Holy art thou in thy holiness, supreme in thy supremacy, gracious in thy graciousness, and praised be thou in the holiness of thy majesty, O Lord, who thyself shinest like the light and who comest forth from the Father, a fountain of glory; who wast born of Mary, her son; who is not inferior to the Father, the creator of heaven and earth, the heaven of heavens, but yet wast born of the womb of a virgin, for us men and for our salvation; who didst descend into the water and wast baptized in water; who didst become the food of all creatures, which was freely given, and who didst fulfil all expectation. Three persons were with us; they made all the world one, as one com-

munion, and as one power, and connected it with the heavenly father. He was made, but not as we; he suffered, but not as we. By the power of his word, law is established. He is, indeed, our law from above; his law thundereth from the tops of the mountains. Precious is he who dwells above the highest heavens; profound is he who descends into the depths of the abyss where storm and hunger reign, accompanied by fire in the midst of much smoke. No one shall enter, and none shall go out, except we who are his chosen flock, even those whose ears and eyes are attentive.

The institution

The priest shall say

Thou tookest bread in thy holy hands that thou mightest give to thy pure disciples. Thou who then didst bless, bless now this bread. Thou who then didst break, break now this bread. Likewise, thou didst mix the cup, the wine and the water, to give to thy pure apostles. Thou who then didst sanctify, sanctify now this cup; thou who then didst present, present now this cup; thou who then didst join, join now the bread with this cup; may they be thy body and thy blood.

The deacon shall say

Lift up your hearts.

The invocation

The priest shall say

Let the door of light be open, let the portals of glory be swung wide, let the veil be moved from the Father's face, and let the Lamb of God come down; let him descend upon this priestly table before me thy sinful servant; let him descend upon this bread and this chalice and receive this oblation, for ever and ever.

The intercession

The priest shall say

Let us say the Prayer of the Fraction

O God, maker of all things, giver of all things, whom angels and archangels worship, powers and dominions, might and strength, the

sun, the moon, and the stars, and all grades; for from the beginning subjection, majesty, and dominion are his. He who was rich in all made himself poor in all. Love drew down the mighty Son from his throne, and brought him even to death. O Rich One, who resisted not those who dragged him along, and bent his neck to those who slaughtered him! O Lamb, who was dumb before his shearers! O Patient One, who opened not his mouth in his suffering, before those who smote him. O Bread, who came forth from the treasures which Joseph brought, and found therein the precious gem of the onyx! O Chalice, who came forth from the virginal chamber! This sign of the cross, which is separate from the bread, is not separate or different, the form and softness, and taste are one. As the form of this sign of the cross is not separate nor different from the bread, in like manner his deity is not separate nor diverse from his humanity. And therefore he is not separate nor diverse. This sign of the cross is not separate from the bread. Thus, thy majesty was commingled with our lowliness, and our lowliness with thy majesty, O Lord our Almighty God.

The communion

The deacon shall say

Pray ye.

The priest shall say

O Lord, God of all, thou hast led us to praise and to adore thee, for thou hast given to us grace, purity, and the fount of thy being and of thy godhead. Moreover, thou hast prepared thy people, and led us to purity and faith in thee, to knowledge and love of thee, to the end that thou hast revealed thyself to us and to all mankind in the person of thy only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The priest shall say

The hosts of the angels of the Saviour of the world stand before the Saviour of the world and encompass the Saviour of the world, even the body and blood of the Saviour of the world. And let us come before the face of the Saviour of the world, in whose faith we trust. In Christ we trust.

The inclination*The deacon shall say*

Stand.

The priest shall say

Give light upon us, O Jesus Christ, thou who didst separate light from darkness. Preserve those who are thine. Lift them up that they may praise thee, and send them forth from thee to help and to sustain. Preserve them and bless them, who are nurtured by the holy eucharist, through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The dismissal*The deacon shall say*

Pray ye.

The priest shall say

To thee we appeal, to thee we make our supplication for ever and ever. Carry us heavenward in spirit by the word of thy wisdom, and reveal to us and to our children the word of thy commandment. Give us sight to see ourselves, that we may turn and be sanctified. Reveal to us these mysteries of thy only-begotten Son, in this sacrifice, thy love and forgiveness. Make us vessels meet for thy reception; cleanse and purify our hearts from all vanity. Send down upon us the grace of thy Holy Spirit, that we may salute the holy sacrifice with a holy kiss, even Christ our God and Saviour, the maker of heaven and earth, the eternal, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, to whom, with thee and with the Holy Ghost, be glory and dominion, both now and ever and world without end. Amen.

THE DEW CULT OF MOUNT HERMON

By ERIC BURROWS, S.J., Campion Hall, Oxford

1. The interesting speculation of E. HOMMEL on this subject in the last (Jan. 1926) number of the *Journal* (pp. 44-61, *Der Taukult des Hermongebirges*) is naturally founded to a large extent on טל הרמן ו', Ps. 133, 3: but is הרמן authentic?

Everyone admits that the verse is very difficult as it stands—"the dew of Hermon which descends on the mountains of Sion": HOMMEL himself adopts the correction שִׁיָּאן for צִיּוֹן. I propose instead a correction of הרמן, reading "the dew of fatness (טל הרשן) which descends on the mountains of Sion."

Dew is here parallel with *chrism* in the preceding verse. Comparison between dew and oil was natural enough, dew being to the health of nature as anointing to the well-being and beauty of man: cf. also the connection between טל and שָׁמֶן in Gen. 27^{28, 39}; the association of dew and oil in one treasury in Slav. *Secrets of Henoch* 6; and perhaps 2 Sam. 1²¹.

Oil in the quality of sacred chrism might be compared with the "dew of heaven" or the dew "from Jahwe" with additional point. It is interesting that كُدَى means *dew, fatness and perfume*. Anyway, it is a fact that dew is compared with oil in the present psalm, and the description "dew of fatness" would suitably emphasize the parallelism.

In ψ 65¹² we actually find רשן used to denote the drops sent by Jahwe upon the hills, &c.

The error הרמן for הרשן would be due, probably, to a single accidental stroke that gave a tail to an old ש. הר for הר would follow sooner or later to make sense of a sort.

The meaning of the Psalm will be evident. The pleasantness of life in the pious community of Sion is compared with the sacred unction upon the priests, which is paralleled with the dew of fatness *from Jahwe* upon the mountains of Sion, which is a symbol of the blessings there given by Jahwe.

2. *Orotal* as a dew-god. E. HOMMEL *loc. cit.* 49 suggests for *Ὀροταλ* in Herod. III 8 a derivation from *אורו* and *טל*: Sein Licht ist (oder spendet) Tau (cf. Is. 26, 9).

But may not the otherwise unknown *Ὀροταλ(τ)* be explained as follows?—

- (1) The *τ* is dittographed from *την* following. Read, with some MSS., *OPOTAA* (as HOMMEL does).
- (2) Emend *OBOTAA*.
- (3) Suppose an original or scribal metathesis: *OBOΔAT*.

Thus according to Herod. the principal god of the Arabs (Nabataeans) would be Obodat; and Teut. *adv. nat.* II 8 says the same: quanti sunt qui norint... Obodan e[τ] Dusarem Arabum.¹ There is also native Nabataean evidence for a divine 'Obodat.²

July, 1926.

¹ Cf. CUMONT, *Rev. arch.* 40 (1902. 1) 297–300, who makes part of this correction, but arrives at *Ὀβοταλτ*, suggesting a composite 'Obodat + Allath or a theophorous *טל* + Allath.

² Perhaps not always a deified king: cf. CUMONT *loc. cit.*; also *Ζευ Ὀβοδα βροηθει* (A. MUSIL, *Arabia Petraea*, Bd. 2, Teil 2, 246). As a god's name Obodat would mean not *servant* but (like *Ḥarithat*) Husbandman (cf. FR. HOMMEL, *Eth. u. Geog.*, 1926, 719⁴): 'Obodat-Edom or the like would be a suitable name for the god (cf. *ibid.*). If *ḏDú-šar-ra* in 4 R no. 1, col. 1, 12f. is really Dusares, the Nab. god (cf. O. SCHROEDER, *ZA* 30, 1915/16, 284 ff.), it is worth noticing that he is there called *urū-a = eriš*, syn. with Husbandman, 'Obodat....

REVIEWS

The Mummy. By Sir E. A. Wallis Budge. Cambridge: University Press, 1925, pp. 513.

This famous book appears a second time in a revised and greatly enlarged form. All students of Egyptology knew the first edition well. This second edition is the same useful handbook of Egyptian funerary archaeology brought up to date. Important discoveries covering the last thirty-two years, since its first appearance in 1893, have been incorporated in this new edition.

But the book is even more than its sub-title would indicate, for, among other things, it gives a brief history of Egypt, a list of royal names, an account of the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, an account of the Egyptian language, writing, and writing materials, a discussion of the Book of the Dead, and notes on all conceivable subjects in Egyptian archaeology, history and religion. Moreover, it is the work of a man of massive learning, and one who knows Egypt and Egyptian matters as well as any other living person. The handsome volume is a veritable mine of information, news for the learner, and reminders for the learned. It is beautifully illustrated by a whole series of new pictures, and wherever possible the hieroglyphic text is introduced.

It would be quite impossible to touch on all the excellencies of this fine book. The student must own it and read it for himself. It is almost as indispensable for the student of the Old Testament and Egyptology as a dictionary or encyclopaedia—in fact it is a kind of dictionary of Egyptology.

No book is perfect, and least of all a book on such a new and difficult science as that of Egyptology. And so a reader of this book might complain that illustrations are confined to those of objects in the British Museum. Now, one realizes the richness of the British Museum's collection, but some of the best objects illustrating Egyptian Archaeology are not to be found in the British Museum. Then, again, in a new edition, why refer to Winckler's edition of the Tell el-Amarna tablets in Berlin when

we have the new and better edition of Schroeder's? Many such questions arise as one makes one's way through this volume, but they are insignificant in comparison with the real worth of this book. There are very few misprints, such as, for example, 1820 for 1920 on page 233, and the printers work leaves very little to be desired.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

From Tribe to Empire. By A. Moret and G. Davy. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1926, pp. 371. 16/- net.

The sub-title of this volume indicates its real subject. It reads: "Social Organization among Primitives and in the Ancient East." The authors herein come face to face with the problem of the social element in human culture. They show that the earliest records reveal a social organization already considerably developed.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part, Davy shows how, by a comparative study of the social institutions of backward peoples of today, it is possible to reconstruct the earlier stages in social organization. On the basis of the work done by Davy, Moret follows the evolution of Egyptians and Babylonians from early and scattered groups of totemic clans to nations and empires of the second millennium B.C.

The first part of the book is necessarily hypothetical to a large extent, but the second part deals mostly with ascertained and established facts. The first chapter of this second part is particularly well done. In it the origins of social life and political institutions in Egypt are traced. In chapter three the same is done for the Semitic world. Some illuminating material is collected on clan ensigns and on the rise of kingship, especially in Egypt. Note that on page 131 the title "Pschent" should be placed under the double crown in the third place, and that on page 149 *khenly* should read *khenty*.

Part three deals with the first Empires of the Orient, where the Hyksos movement is brilliantly described, where the "Concert of Nations in the Fifteenth Century" is outlined with much learning and insight, and where the Egypto-Hittite Entente is traced with the sure hand of an expert.

It will, I think, be disputed whether Ikhnaton ever thought of his religious reform as a means of establishing a world empire,

as Moret seems to think, for Ikhnaton was apparently without the slightest genius for government, yet Moret has drawn his picture of the development of Egypt and Babylonia from clan to empire with such a certain hand that minor details, where difference of opinion may arise, can be ignored. Building on the work of Davy, Professor Moret has made in this book a lasting contribution to a very difficult but fascinating subject. The book must be read from cover to cover to be adequately appreciated—and it will bear more readings than one.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

De oostersche grondslag der kunstgeschiedenis (het oude Egypte en Voorazië). Door F. W. Freiherr von Bissing. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1925.

Das schmale, in holländischer Sprache erschienene Bändchen enthält folgende Abschnitte: 1. Architektur, 2. Ornamentik, 3. Kunstgewerbe, 4. Plastik, 5. Relief und Malerei und zerfällt in einen Hauptteil (S. 1–32) sowie in einen Anhang mit Literaturnachweisen und Anmerkungen (S. 33–64). Das Buch wendet sich in erster Linie an die holländischen Studenten der altorientalischen Kunstgeschichte, aber ich glaube, daß es auch dem Kenner der ägyptischen und vorderasiatischen Archäologie von Nutzen sein wird. Wer die enorme Anzahl von v. Bissings weitverstreuten Einzeluntersuchungen einigermaßen übersieht, weiß, daß der Verfasser auf Grund seiner hervorragenden Monumentenkenntnis wie kein anderer befähigt ist, sowohl über die ägyptische als auch über die vorderasiatische Kunstgeschichte zu urteilen. Die vorliegende Arbeit faßt in möglichster Kürze v. Bissings Lebensarbeit zusammen und gehört meines Ermessens wegen der Prägnanz, mit der sie geschrieben ist, eher in die Hand des älteren Forschers als in die des Studenten, der freilich den „Grundriß“ als Nachschlagewerk und Wegweiser durch die Literatur stets gern zu Rate ziehen wird.

Meine kurze Besprechung wäre ganz ungenügend, wenn nicht ausdrücklich darauf hingewiesen würde, daß v. Bissings „Grundriß“ bisher die einzige Arbeit ihrer Art ist. Jedenfalls kenne ich bis heute keine zusammenhängende Darstellung der ägyptischen und vorderasiatischen Kunstgeschichte von demselben Verfasser.

Daß das in dem bekannten Verlage von Martinus Nijhoff erschienene Bändchen sich uns in einer würdigen äußeren Form präsentiert,

versteht sich von selbst. Vom Standpunkt der Wissenschaft ist es aber zu bedauern, daß es in holländischer Sprache erschienen ist, die zweifellos den meisten Orientalisten und Kunsthistorikern unverständlich bleibt. Wenn auch zu hoffen ist, daß v. Bissings uns später einmal ein größeres Werk über die ägyptische und vorderasiatische Kunstgeschichte schenken wird, so wäre es doch sehr zu begrüßen, wenn zunächst einmal der kurze Grundriß in einer der vier Kongreßsprachen erscheinen würde.

LUDWIG KEIMER

Die Gartenpflanzen im Alten Ägypten. Von Ludwig Keimer. Bd. I. Hamburg-Berlin: Hoffmann und Campe, 1924, pp. 187.

This is the first volume of a great work planned to cover the flora of Ancient Egypt. In preparation for his task Dr. Keimer studied Egyptian under Erman, Meyer, and Möller. His attention was called to this particular topic by Heinrich Schaefer, and he has been guided in the botanical side of his task by Georg Schweinfurth, than whom no one is a greater authority on the flora of Egypt. There are to be two more volumes, the third being devoted chiefly to pictures of the plants.

In the volume before us forty-four plants are studied, each plant being fully described, together with a discussion of its nature, ancient examples of it being given, figures of it on the monuments, its names and modern equivalents. Thus we have a standard work. This main part of the book is followed by over forty pages of valuable notes and references, and that in turn is followed by over sixty autographed pages packed with discussions of technicalities, with much hieroglyphic text, and with sketches of the ancient figures of the plants under consideration.

Dr. Keimer is performing an unique task in a thoroughly scientific manner. Let us hope that he is enabled to bring his great task to completion.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die Bewaffnung des altägyptischen Heeres. Von Walter Wolf. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1926, pp. 108, pls. 22, ill. 71. M. 8.

In a masterful manner, with full references and illustrations, Dr. Wolf traces the development of the Egyptian army from the earliest times down to the end of the New Kingdom. This fine work leaves little to be desired. It will serve as a reference book

on its subject for many years. Of particular interest to Old Testament students is the chapter on the Middle Kingdom and the Period of the Hyksos.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The People and the Book. Edited by Arthur S. Peake. Toronto: Oxford University Press, Canadian Branch, 1925, pp. 508.

This is a book of essays by members of the English *Society for Old Testament Study*. Each essay is by an expert. The first is by Hall of the British Museum on "Israel and the Surrounding Nations." It is clear but full of technicalities, and therefore difficult for the general reader. He thinks "the Exodus is the expulsion of the Hyksos looked at from the peculiar angle of Jewish tradition," and, therefore, dates it earlier than Merneptah. In a foot-note on page 15 he says that the identity of the Khabiru and Hebrews is accepted by most scholars—a slight exaggeration. He also thinks that the Israel stela "proves conclusively that the Exodus took place before the time of Menepthah," but "doubtful things are mighty uncertain."

"The Religious Environment of Israel" by S. A. Cook is by far too fragmentary and disconnected to furnish an adequate picture of the environment. The mass of material thrown together without any rhyme or reason seems like "an accident going somewhere to happen." But G. R. Driver's "The Modern Study of the Hebrew Language" will be very much appreciated as well by the Old Testament specialist as by the beginner. What Driver has to say on page 111 about the Khabiru contrasts with what we have noted as Hall's opinion. This point illustrates the many inconsistencies in the volume, which are to be deplored, in spite of the multiple authorship. Welch's "The History of Israel" is splendidly done. Here again, contrast what Welch says about the Khabiru (here spelled Habiru), page 123, with what Hall says on page 15, note 2. Note also the misprints on page 124, "Hykso" for "Hyksos," which are too frequent in this book.

"The methods of Higher Criticism" by T. H. Robinson is excellently done, and so is the next essay, "The Present Position of Old Testament Criticism" by J. E. McFadyen. In fact this, I think, is the best essay in the book. At any rate the clearest, although one is surprised that in his discussion of the prophetic

attitude to the cult he fails to record that such men as J. M. P. Smith are now inclining to feel that the prophets did not intend to condemn sacrifice as such.

"The Hebrew Religion from Moses to Saul" by Lofthouse is done well, although there are many points which one would challenge, for example, "of the qualities of Sin we know really nothing"!, page 225; nor is it certain that "sacrifice had no place in the Mosaic teaching." Peake's "The Religion of Israel from David to the Return from Exile" is more tempered, but perhaps less accurate, for example, he says that "no term short of ethical monotheism can do justice to his (Amos) conception of Yahweh."

"The Development of the Religion of Israel from the Return to the Death of Simon the Maccabee" by Barnes is systematic and Oesterley's "Worship and Ritual" is excellent. Note how Oesterley, on page 333, contradicts what Lofthouse said about Sacrifice in early times. H. W. Robinson in "Hebrew Psychology" has made an excellent contribution to Old Testament study, following closely on Burton's fine work. Kennett writes on "The Contribution of the Old Testament to the Religious Development of Mankind," in which he emphasises revelation rather than discovery; and Abrahams contributes an excellent account of the "Jewish Interpretation of the Old Testament," a chapter full of information and fresh observations. "The Value and Significance of the Old Testament in Relation to the New" by Box is one of the best essays in the book. The volume ends with a good bibliography, a fair index, and a fragment of an address by the late lamented Gray.

On the whole, the volume fills a gap and can be with little reserve recommended to the general student of the Old Testament.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Sacrifice in the Old Testament. By G. B. Gray. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925, pp. 434.

Dr. Gray died in November 1922. Among the papers were found manuscripts of his Speaker lectures on Sacrifice in almost complete form. They are herein edited.

The author of this important book confines himself to a discussion of the theory and practice of sacrifice, the first six sections being devoted to the former. As to the theory, he says in general that

while propitiation and expiation as the end of sacrifice were in the earlier periods of the history of Israel anything but unknown or even exceptional, it was also far from being constant or even relatively frequent. Sacrifice was more often eucharistic than propitiatory, and it was more often offered with feelings of joy and security than in fear or contrition.

In discussing the second division of his work, namely, the practice of sacrifice, he divides his subject into three parts; The Altar, The Hebrew Priesthood, and The Festivals. In reference to the altar, he shows that the temple had two altars, one of great size, built of natural untrimmed stone, standing in front of the temple under the open heaven, the other of small size, constructed within of wood but covered with the costliest of all metals standing within the temple, in the centre of the Holy Place before the veil which screened off the Holy of Holies. The sections on the priesthood are intensely interesting, although the author does not strive after newness of interpretation. The festivals are discussed with a freshness and vigour which is attractive.

Three appendices contain notes on the Materials of Sacrifice, The Minaean Inscriptions, and a selection from the *Megillath Ta'anith*. Full indices are supplied, and the whole work is prefaced by a list of Dr. Gray's published books and articles.

There is very little to criticize in this fine piece of work. It is a student's book and will repay repeated readings.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Enzyklopädie des Judentums. (Probeheft.) Berlin: Eschkol.

The two specimen brochures are the forerunners of a great literary undertaking, planned and organized by the Eschkol Publishing Company of Berlin, Germany; namely, the publishing of a new Jewish Encyclopaedia, or, rather, as the editors prefer to call it, an Encyclopaedia of Judaism, in two languages—Hebrew and German. That there is need of a new Jewish Encyclopaedia, almost every one interested in Semitic studies in general, and in Jewish knowledge in particular, will agree. The standard encyclopaedia of this kind, the one published in America, is already more than twenty years old; and, the material given there, though masterly presented, is somewhat antiquated in many respects. Numerous researches during

these past twenty years in the fields of Jewish and Semitic scholarship have thrown fresh light on a number of subjects, so that their restatement is quite a necessity; especially does this hold true regarding certain periods in Jewish history—such as the Gaonic, the conception of which was almost revolutionized by the Cairo Genizah material, discovered by Drs. Schechter and Taylor. Still more obvious is the need of rewriting all articles dealing with current Jewish life and history. The last twenty years, due to the Great War and its resultant effects, have brought about a complete change in Jewish life, in all its phases—economic, political, and cultural, so, that this vast subject must be revalued and restated in accordance with changed conditions.

Besides fulfilling these needs, the editors of the new Encyclopaedia—among whom there are well known scholars, such as Professor Elbogen, authority on Jewish Liturgy, Professor Guttman, great Talmudic scholar, Professor Weil, a known Arabist and authority on Islam, and the Editor-in-Chief, Dr. J. Klatzkin, a prominent Jewish Philosopher—promise us a good deal more, namely, a change in method. An encyclopaedia of Judaism, they say, due to the intrinsic inter-relation of its various subjects, cannot, like other encyclopaedias, follow the strict alphabetical system. Such a system, necessarily, breaks up the unity of subjects which are of a more complex nature, inasmuch as the strict alphabetical order, scatters articles intrinsically related over different volumes. They propose, therefore, to supplement the alphabetical system, by the monographic order, namely, that important subjects shall be treated not only as articles, but as separate monographs, grouping all subjects of a secondary nature but related to the main subject, under that monograph. This tendency will undoubtedly introduce unity in the treatment of the leading phases of Judaism and will be of great benefit, both for the scholar and average intellectual user of the encyclopaedia. It remains for us, to see how well the specimens carry out the good intentions of the editors.

The specimen brochures contain a limited number of articles in common, while the majority of them are on different subjects. As far as the specimen articles are concerned, they justify in a measure our expectations of a new encyclopaedia of Judaism. They deal with new subjects not included in the older encyclopaedias, such as the article, "Autonomy," both in Hebrew and German,

describing the various forms of autonomous life the Jews enjoyed in the Diaspora during the ages. The article gives a fair picture of that phase of Jewish life. The last paragraph, however, should have been omitted, inasmuch as it contains an appeal by the author for the granting of autonomous rights to the Jews in various East-European countries. An encyclopaedia is no place for appeal making.

The articles, "Alchemy," "Art," and "Crafts" (Omonuth and Umnuth, in Hebrew; Kunst and Handwerk, in German) are fair specimens of articles, rewritten and restated with breadth of view, and in the light of added knowledge. The Jewish Encyclopaedia limits the treatment of the last two subjects to the Biblical period, and only touches slightly, on the development of arts and crafts among the Jews in post-Biblical periods, giving a rather rough sketch of the Talmudic and Mediaeval periods only. The articles in our specimens cover the subject thoroughly, especially the article on "Art." Each successive period and each country of the Diaspora is given due consideration. In these two articles, the writers come the nearest to the fulfilling of the promise of the editors regarding monographic treatment of subjects.

The results of the researches of various scholars in fields of Jewish history, especially of the discovery of the Genizah material, is quite evident in such articles as "Alexandria" (Hebrew and German), "Askalon" (German), where new light is thrown on the history of the Jews in those cities from Genizah documents.

We must confess, though, that the editors did hardly realize, on the whole, their claim to introducing the new monographic method, as even these specimens contain a number of articles which should rather have been subsumed under large subject articles, such as "Ob V'Yiddoni" (Hebrew), "Religion of Ancient Persia" (Hebrew and German), and "Aramaic and Aramaisms in the Bible" (German). They should have been included under, "Magic and Sorcery," "Persia," and "Aramaic," or "Bible," respectively.

The first article on "Ob V'Yiddoni" is noteworthy, on account of the author's plausible theory, that "Ob" means the instrument, a kind of bellows, by means of which, the spirit was blown out of the pit in form of air. We find a similar procedure in the tables of the Gilgamesh poem (Table XII). This interpretation, supported by reference to Job XXXII:19 where "Obboth" means

"leather bottles," is preferable to the accepted interpretation that "Ob" means the spirit itself, and that "Obboth" refers to those possessed by the spirit, as we find distinctly in I Samuel XXVIII:7, the appellation "Balaath Ob" for the sorcerers. This explanation (of the encyclopaedia) satisfies also, the words, "made an Ob" found in II Kings XXII:6, which gave rise to H. P. Smith's theory that "Ob" is an idol, an explanation which is otherwise unsatisfactory. The word "made" presents no difficulty, according to our author's explanation, if it refers to an instrument. The same plausibility, however, cannot be applied to the same author's (Prof. Torczyner) suggestions and emendations in his second article, "Aramäisch und Aramäismus in der Bibel," where, in his zeal for Aramaisms, he proposes to read "Rēv Ḥalomoth" in Job VI:6, for "Rir Ḥalomuth," interpreting it as "Traumgesicht—look of dreams." The Masoretic reading which is usually translated: Is there any taste in the white of an egg?, is certainly more tasteful. It is impossible to speak of taste in connection with dreams. Equally tasteless is his other emendation in Job XIII:4, reading "Tophlē Šōker" instead of "Tophele Sheker," and interpreting it as plasterers of face paint, drawing the simile of women painting their faces to cover deficiencies,—rather a far fetched interpretation. The Masoretic Text is undoubtedly the correct one, and is supported by Psalms CXIX:69, where the same verb and noun are used, and can in no way be interpreted otherwise. Such dubious conjectures are out of place in an encyclopaedia and do not demonstrate the objectivity of which the editors speak.

A number of other articles, such as Abulefia (a well known XIIIth Century Cabalist), Abraham Ibn Ezra, and others, are written in a careless manner. The cabalistic ideas of the one and the philosophy of the other are not stated clearly and are insufficiently grounded. The great merit of an encyclopaedia is the clearness and perspicuity with which the subjects are treated.

These strictures, however, do not by any means detract from the merit of the undertaking. The editors should, however, take them into consideration, and endeavor to live up to the principles enunciated in their Preface. The attempt is, undoubtedly, praiseworthy, and upon accomplishing it, they will have laid every lover of Jewish and Semitic studies under obligation.

MEYER WAXMAN

Israel and Babylon. By W. L. Wardle. New York: Flemming H. Revell Company, 1925, pp. 343. \$2.50.

There are a great many books on this subject, but none is saner, wiser, or abler than this one. Dr. Wardle knows sufficient cuneiform to be able to check his translations, and he has withal a sound, judicious mind. Moreover, he writes in a very easy, clear, and interesting style.

In his introduction the author surveys his subject, and then in chapter two he gives us a brief account of Palestine, Egypt, Babylonia, and their peoples. In "Israel's Ancestors" we find many instances of Dr. Wardle's saneness, especially in the matter of his treatment of the Exodus. He says rightly on page 44, note 3, that the identification of the H̄abiru with the Hebrews is rejected by a number of scholars, although the H̄abiru embraced the Hebrews. He says that "on the whole the dating of the Exodus in the reign of Merenptah—remains the most probable hypothesis," and "that those Israelites who sojourned in Egypt were not the whole stock of the people."

In "Some Features of Babylonian Religion," the subject of chapter four, Dr. Wardle has presented a most excellent outline of that difficult subject, with abundant extracts from native literature. In discussing, "The Origins of Hebrew Monotheism," the author comes face to face with the assertions of those who see in Babylonia a definite tendency towards monotheism and in Egypt the establishment of a real monotheism in the reign of Ikhnaton. The former he admits with reservations, but the latter he wisely rejects.

The author contrasts the Babylonian Creation stories with those in the Old Testament, and finds it easy to demonstrate the superiority of the latter; but he takes Langdon's *Sumerian Epic of Paradise, The Flood and the Fall of Man* too seriously, although he wisely concludes "that no complete parallel to the Paradise story has been found in Babylonian literature." In his chapter on the Ante-Diluvians, he makes excellent use of the valuable material recently published by Langdon, whose pioneer work in the matter calls for much praise. As to the Deluge, he admits that the arguments point strongly to Babylonia as the original source of the Genesis deluge story. But the Babylonians had no real

equivalent of the Hebrew Sabbath. His discussion of "the Pan-Babylonian Theory" is particularly fine. It should be read again and again. The whole book is neatly summed up in a final "Retrospect."

This is the very best book in English on this interesting subject. It may be recommended without reserve to all students of Biblical archaeology.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The Speeches of Elihu. A study of Job XXXII-XXXVII. By William E. Staples. Toronto: University Press, 1925, pp. 84.

After an introduction to the speeches, where it is claimed that they offer a real solution in comparison with that found in the Yahweh speeches, Dr. Staples gives a tabulation of words in the various parts of Job, then a translation of his emended text of Elihu's speeches, with this text in Hebrew, and justificatory notes. The work is honestly and industriously done, but is to a great extent disappointing, although not more than the work of many other textual critics. The author is not aware of recent literature, not even of the recent commentaries of Rabinowitz, Jastrow, Torczyner, and Bittenwieser. He does not know of Richter's *Erläuterungen zu dunkeln Stellen im Buche Hiob* (1912), nor of Barton's notes on Elihu, JBL 43, 228, nor of Kimchi's commentary partly edited by Eppenstein in REJ 1898, 86-102 completing Schwarz' previous edition of it. His method of using the versions is that of a departing generation of scholars, who did not take into account the idiosyncrasy of translators, and did not distinguish the various strata of the Greek text. The reviewer feels that he must again protest, at least in the name of common sense, against the rewriting of the most wonderful Hebrew poetry by Western scholars, who make it flat and insipid, and sometimes ungrammatical as well. Why for instance *the waw* in וַ p. 40 v. 9? In v. 12 the translation "testimonies" is impossible, unless 'ed is to be changed to 'eduth, an unnecessary change; p. 46 v. 7 add dagesh in א; v. 12, use of 'alam without an object is no improvement on Job's Hebrew; v. 14, the last word is badly vocalized; v. 20, read *waw* for *nun*; v. 12, the text is arbitrarily corrected; v. 23, *le'el* gives a lame Hebrew line. V. 21 much more could have been done with the help of the Greek; p. 59 v. 23a, not Hebrew!

V. 29, last word punctuation incomplete; v. 31, punctuation of 'amar is not correct; v. 33 is made quite flat; p. 68 v. 21b, *boharta* is certainly more awkward than MT; p. 77 v. 11b is flat and based on a doubtful meaning of 'ed; p. 77 line 3 last word, the Ketibh is ungrammatical and is followed here. Too often, Dr. Staples' corrections of the text are unnecessary and weaken its force. The reviewer claims that the text should not be changed unless it is clearly corrupt, and not because we do not understand it. The author of the speeches, and indeed the author of the whole poem, or if you like, its compiler, had his own grammar, which should be studied thoroughly, and he certainly knew his own language. In spite of this criticism of Dr. Staples' work we must commend him for daring to be original, and for being industrious. It is probably wrong to blame him for using methods handed to him, and supposedly scholarly.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament. Von Hugo Gressmann in Verbindung mit Erich Ebeling, Hermann Ranke und Nikolaus Rhodokanakis. Berlin und Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1926. Erste Lieferung, pp. 112.

The first edition of this famous book appeared in 1909. This is a second, changed, and enlarged edition. The same general plan remains, otherwise the book is almost a new one. Much has been done in Oriental research since 1909; especially in Egypt, so much so that the Egyptian texts in this edition have been placed first. A future part of the work will contain about 675 pictures illustrating the text of this and succeeding Lieferungen.

No student of the Nearer East can be satisfied with the old edition of this work. There are in the new edition, among other new things, the new Hittite material, the new Tell el-Amarna letters, the new inscriptions of Bethshan, the new additions to the Babylonian Epic of Creation, the new Gezer and Byblos texts, the Achikar text from the Elephantine Papyri, and the South Arabian texts. These are a few of the additions not to mention the Precepts of Amenemope. We await with impatience the completion of this great and useful work, when a full review of it will appear in this *Journal*.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The Psalms. Translated by J. M. Powis Smith. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1926, pp. 274. \$3.00 net.

Professor Smith's unrivalled knowledge of the Old Testament, his command of a very pure English, his special training as a translator, and his studies in the religion of the Psalms, all prepared him for the task which lies finished in the book before us.

After a brief preface and a full list of contents, the translation begins. The student needs only to read these fine renderings to be fascinated. Of course, there are translations which will not meet with universal approval, such for example as, "Kiss his feet with trepidation" in Ps. 2 : 12, but no translation would possibly satisfy that demand.

There are two appendices. The first contains a discussion of the following points: The Date of the Psalter, The Hymnbook of the Second Temple, The Poetry of the Psalter, and The Religion of the Psalter; the second contains useful textual notes.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Taboo among the Ancient Hebrews. By A. C. James. Philadelphia, 1925, pp. 71.

This is Dr. James' thesis for the Ph.D. degree at the University of Pennsylvania. The author limits himself to early religion and to the major taboos. He does not include taboos connected with war, which should, at least, be examined for a possible relation with blood taboos. We wonder why the author goes to the trouble of using so many Hebrew characters for words which are quite common and clear. What authority could he give for the statement that the Arab *makes* (italics ours) the circuit of the Kaaba either naked or in borrowed garment (p. 41)? It is also much to be regretted that the author did not investigate the Talmudic material as well. His bibliographical notes seem to show that his reading has been largely with secondary sources and that he has neglected, to a great extent, the more recent literature on the subject. However, he has done an honest piece of work and his results are of value, as a confirmation of those of other scholars.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Midrash Sifre on Numbers. By Paul P. Levertoff. London: SPCK, 1926, pp. 162. 7s. 6d. net.

The Sifre on Numbers, of which this book contains a selection, is largely concerned with the exposition of legal rules, and embodies the work of a school distinct from that represented by the Sifre on Deuteronomy. Both the Sifre on Numbers and that on Deuteronomy are really an attempt to justify traditional laws of life and ritual, against the objections of the Sadducees, by deducing them from the text of Scripture. The volume before us contains the only translation of the text of Sifre on Numbers. The book has a good introduction, and the text is well supplied with necessary notes.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Studien zum biblischen Versöhnungstag. By Simon Landersdorfer. Münster, Aschendorff, 1924, pp. 94. M. 3.60.

An excellent study of the Day of Atonement. The author studies the vestments of the high priest, Azazel, the day of atonement as new year's festival, the day of Atonement in P and in Ezekiel, the day of Atonement and Neh. 8, the antiquity of that day, and finally the literary problem of Lev. 16. The learned abbot of Scheyern was remarkably prepared for the study of this rite. He is one of the foremost assyriologists of the day, his method of approach, his knowledge of sources and of the literature are above criticism. His point of view seems to us far sounder than that of the hide-bound academic biblical criticism of some scholars. We may only here pass a few remarks suggested by Dr. Landersdorfer's book. On p. 9, we would have added that possibly the terminology of the LXX in the description of the high priest's vestments gives us the second century use, which *may* not necessarily be the ancient one; p. 16 the use of a rooster in the ritual of Kapparoth may be compared here and may go back to Babylon, where we find demons with rooster's feet. Dr. Landersdorfer rightly believes that the day of atonement is preexilic. His little book is a welcome addition to the *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen* edited by Dr. Nikel.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

A century of Excavation in Palestine. By R. A. S. Macalister. London, Religious Tract Society.

Dr. Macalister brings to his task the talent of a famous expert. He does not attempt to give an exhaustive statement of archaeological research in Palestine, but only of most important results. He writes in too modest a fashion of his own research at Gezer. The book takes up the results in topical form: sketch of the history of excavation, excavation and topography, then political, cultural, and religious history. There is an index. The illustrations are good and sufficiently numerous. The style is excellent and there is no overcrowding of information. This is a book designed for the layman, and the best of its kind today. JOHN A. MAYNARD

The Holy Bible: A New Translation. By James Moffatt. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1926, Cloth \$5.00.

Dr. Moffatt has aimed at a presentation of the books of the Old and New Testament in effective and intelligible English. He has succeeded in doing so. A casual reading of this masterpiece makes this quite evident. Moreover, he supplies the reader of the Bible with an informing introduction of forty-three pages giving clear accounts of such items as the People and Land of Palestine, the Literature of the Old and New Testament, the Septuagint, the Text, the Synoptic Problem, the Versions, &c.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die Lösung des Sinaischriftproblems der Althamudischen Schrift. Von Hubert Grimme. Münster: Aschendorff, 1926, pp. 68.

Grimme's *Althebräische Inschriften von Sinai* made quite a stir in the world of Oriental scholarship. Its fame spread far and wide and soon reached the ears of news-paper reporters, with the result that Grimme's statements were exaggerated and highly coloured. This was especially true of Grimme's use, with great reserve, of the name of Moses in connection with his interpretation of a certain passage. Not aware of, or, blind to news-paper exaggeration, Sethe, Erman, Grapow, and even Gardiner of London said many unkind and unwise things about Grimme and his work on the Sinai inscriptions.

Shortly after Grimme's book appeared, I read it rather carefully, in the light of my knowledge of South Arabian inscriptions,

which I acquired under the brilliant tutorship of Fritz Hommel. Grimme's work made a great impression upon me, but of some details I had serious doubts. Now Grimme appears with the pamphlet before us, and I am obliged to say that I do not see how Sethe, Erman, Grapow, and Gardiner can refrain from at least a partial recantation—this is especially true of Sethe in view of what Grimme has written in this pamphlet under the heading "Die altsinaitische Schrift." In fact, Sethe seems to me *in honour* bound to reply.

Grimme's work on the Old Thamudic script and on the Sinaitic script proves beyond a doubt that the two were closely related. The matter of the origin of the Sinaitic script is another question, and so is the matter of the exact implications of Grimme's translations of the Sinaitic script. But that the Sinaitic script is Semitic and that Grimme had a right to attempt its interpretations (although not a professed Egyptologist) no reasonable person can doubt. Of course, I think that Sethe, Erman, Grapow, and Gardiner were misled by exaggerated news-paper reports. But the wrong to Grimme should be set right, for Grimme has made a contribution to Oriental research and decipherment of which we are proud, and I am sure such men as Erman, Sethe, Gardiner, and Grapow, when they realize the situation, will be glad to recognize it.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die Ostkanaanaer. Eine philologisch-historische Untersuchung über die Wanderschicht der sogenannten „Amoriter“ in Babylonien. Von Theo Bauer. Leipzig: Verlag der Asia Minor, 1926, pp. 94. M. 20.

Herr Bauer tackles the difficult problem of the Empire of the Amurru, and finds that the hypothesis of an Empire of the Amurru in West Babylonia in the third millennium B.C. is false, and that the MAR-TU of the inscriptions of that time are to be sought in East Babylonia. He divides his research into two parts, a philological and an historical section. The work is excellently done and a great deal of material is assembled. But it must be said that the result is not altogether convincing, although the book must be reckoned with in all future discussions of the problem.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. III: The Assyrian Empire. New York: Macmillan, 1925, pp. 846.

This volume covers the period of Assyrian supremacy in five chapters written by Sidney Smith. The treatment is strikingly different from that of Olmstead in his *History of Assyria*. On the one hand, one misses the testimony of letters and contracts which make the latter more interesting than any *History of Assyria* ever written. On the other hand, one finds in Smith's chapters a cold, accurate, unruffled history, written by one who knows documents at first hand, and whose familiarity with the language is perfect. One chapter is consecrated to the state of Assyrian culture in the days of Ashurbanipal, including a very conservative estimate of the code. Dr. Hogarth writes on the Hittites in Syria, with a few pages on the Assyrian retreat and the Scythian invasion. In a second chapter Dr. Hogarth summarizes what we know of Hittite culture. Dr. Sayce writes on the Kingdom of Van, its history, religion, and culture. The chapter on the Scythians is by Dr. Minns. Like all the others, it is conservative, avoiding unsound hypotheses. The section on Babylonia is by Dr. R. Campbell Thompson. It is made up of a chapter on the New Babylonian Empire which is quite accurate, though rather brief. The next chapter tells us of the influence of Babylonia, and though cramped for space, is an excellent survey of the subject. We now pass to Egypt where Dr. H. R. Hall gives us four chapters on the eclipse of Egypt, the Assyrian period, the Restoration, and Saitic art. Here a comparison will be made by the reader with Breasted's *History* which ignores the latter part of this period, although it has left so clearly its mark upon the country. We now pass to Israel. Dr. Macalister describes "The topography of Jerusalem" with surety of information, and calmness. There are four chapters on Israel and Judah by S. A. Cook. The writer remains, as he should, within the commonly accepted results. Of the six following chapters, on Greece, we are not qualified to give our opinion.

It is evident that the editors made an excellent choice of experts. Their work was also properly correlated, so that the present volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* gives us a sober, well informed, and well balanced statement of the results of recent historical research.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. IV: The Persian Empire and the West. Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock. New York: Macmillan, 1926, pp. 698. \$9.50.

This great series needs little advertisement. The three volumes already issued have now taken their place as standard works. There is nothing better; there is nothing equal to them. This fourth volume in the series is worthy to take its place beside its three companions.

Volume four deals with the Persian Empire and the West including a survey of early Italy. There are sixteen chapters: "The Foundation and Extension of the Persian Empire" by the late Dr. Gray, "The Reform of the Athenian State" and "Athens under the Tyrants" by F. E. Adcock, "The Outer Greek World in the Sixth Century" by P. N. Ure, "Coinage from its Origin to the Persian Wars" by G. F. Hill, "Athens: The Reform of Cleisthenes" by E. M. Walker, "The Reign of Darius" by Dr. Gray, and M. Cary, "Marathon," "Xerxes' Invasion of Greece" and "The Deliverance of Greece" by J. A. R. Munro, "Carthage and Sicily" by R. Hackforth, "Italy in the Etruscan Age" by R. S. Conway and S. Casson, "Greek Literature from the Eighth Century to the Persian Wars" by J. B. Bury, "Mystery Religions and Pre-Socratic Philosophy" by F. M. Cornford, and "Early Greek Art" by J. D. Beazley and D. S. Robertson. Then there are full bibliographies on each chapter, chronological notes, general index, and index to maps, and index to passages referred to and a list of maps, tables, and plans. This is another indispensable volume not only for the student of ancient history but as well for the well-informed general reader.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

La Civilisation Phénicienne. Par G. Contenau. Paris: Payot, 1926, pp. 396, ill. 137. Fr. 25.

This book answers to a long-felt need. Moreover, the many excavations conducted in Phoenicia have rendered antiquated all books on the civilization of that ancient land. Dr. Contenau, well prepared for his task, has contributed to students of the ancient Nearer Orient a book which will remain the standard for some years to come. It should be translated into English and German.

After detailing the sources of our knowledge of Phoenicia he gives a brilliant survey of the geography and history of that country. Then chapters are devoted to the religion, the art, the architecture, navigation, and commerce. A splendid chapter is devoted to the alphabet and language. But it is strange that neither here nor in the bibliography does he mention the important works of Grimme and Sethe on the Sinaitic inscriptions. This is a deplorable omission, for whatever one's attitude may be toward Grimme's decipherment, his work cannot be ignored. The seventh and last chapter is devoted to Phoenicia and Greece and to the origin of Phoenician civilization. There is an excellent bibliography, a useful chronological table of comparative dates, and a full index.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Islamica. Vol. I, 4, edited by A. Fischer, December 1925. Vol. II, 1, edited by E. Bräunlich, April 1926. Leipzig: Asia Major Co.

These two parts of *Islamica* are full of first class material. E. Bräunlich brings to a conclusion his exhaustive study of "the Well in Ancient Arabia," Horovitz attacks Berthel's expressed view on the origin of the Houris. Fischer has a note on the pronunciation of Allah's name in conversation and writes an excellent review of Littmann's *Morgenländische Wörter im Deutschen*, questioning whether Medina was called *Medinat-an nabi*. H. Bauer contributes a searching study of euphemisms in Semitic. Brockelmann studies fables in old Arabic Literature. Fr. Buhl studies the much controverted question "Faßte Muhammed seine Verkündigung als eine universelle, auch für Nichtaraber bestimmte Religion auf?" These are only a few of the excellent articles in this periodical.

J. A. M.

Die Eingeborenen Amerikas. By K. T. Preuß. Tübingen, Mohr, 1926, pp. 65. M. 2.90.

Second edition of a source book on the religion of the American Indian. It is of great value because of its compactness and the excellent choice of subject matter. New readings have been added. The readings are grouped in topics as follows: the state of the dead, shamanism, magical formulas, the supernatural, saviors (including a reading on the all-mother of the Kagaba), gods.

There is an index. This excellent text book is one of the best in Bertholet's *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*. J. A. M.

Ein hethitischer Annalenteil des Königs Muršiliš II. Von Ernst Tenner. Aus *Jubiläums-Festschrift*, Städt. Realschule zu Leipzig, 1926.

This transcription and translation, with notes, of KBo. V 8 = Bo. 2022 will be found of exceptional value by students of Hittite history. The work is highly accurate and reliable, as far as our present knowledge of Hittite will allow. S. A. B. M.

Die Glaubwürdigkeit von Herodots Bericht über Ägypten im Lichte der ägyptischen Denkmäler. Von W. Spiegelberg. *Orient und Antike*, Nr. 3. Heidelberg: Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926, pp. 44.

The proposition under discussion in this pamphlet is fully demonstrated with much useful information by Professor Spiegelberg. It is well that he should call especial attention to this indispensable source for Egyptian study. S. A. B. M.

Die zoroastrische Religion (Das Avesta). By K. F. Geldner. Tübingen: Mohr, 1926, pp. 58. M. 2.50.

A second edition, enlarged and improved of the source book issued in 1908. The first part is made up of readings in the Gathas, the second and larger part of readings in the Later Avesta. The readings are classified according to topics. There is an index. The first edition was well received, the second should be welcomed still more in the new Bertholet's *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*.

J. A. M.

Das babylonische Neujahrsfest. Von Heinrich Zimmern. *Der Alte Orient*, Bd. 25, Heft. 3. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1926, pp. 28, pls. 4. M. 1.20.

Professor Zimmern presents in handy form with appropriate discussions, the material which bears upon the important Babylonian festival of the New Year, and suggests the possible influence of this festival upon later feasts of similar nature. Of particular value to the student of comparative religions are the notes and full bibliography.

S. A. B. M.

Gutium. Von O. Schroeder. Sonderdruck aus *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, Verlag Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.

This is another of Schroeder's useful articles. S. A. B. M.

We all await with much interest Dévaud's edition of *Le Grand Papyrus Harris* (British Museum No. 9999), in hieroglyphic transcription, which has just been announced; as well as his Coptic edition of *Les Proverbes de Salomon*.

S. A. B. M.

1500 Manuscrits scientifiques et littéraires, très anciens en arabe et en syriaque découverts par le R. P. Paul Sbath. Le Caire, Imprimerie de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1926, pp. 22.

Father P. Sbath gives in this reprint of the Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte, notices en 30 Arabic and 1 Syriac manuscript dealing with religion, philosophy, medicine, mathematics, astrology, history. They are of unequal value, but some should be edited. The author is to be complimented on his zeal in making this collection.

J. A. M.

Orientalia. No. 22. Das Draham- und Djoḥa-Archiv (Forts.). I. Der Götterkult. II. Teil. Von Nik. Schneider. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1926, pp. 91.

This excellent number of *Orientalia* contains a great deal of material dealing with the *res sacrifici* in Babylonia. It will be found indispensable to students of the religion of ancient Babylonia.

S. A. B. M.

Excavations at Carthage 1925. A preliminary report. By F. W. Kelsey. New York: Macmillan, 1926, pp. 61.

This brochure sets forth the results of the excavations made at Carthage by a Franco-American expedition. The author is not carried away by unripe enthusiasm, as others have been. The results of the expedition are interesting. The precinct of Tanit now excavated will give us important data to be compared with those of Gezer and elsewhere in the field of Semitic religion. Carthage should be excavated before it is too late.

J. A. M.

The Babylonian Officials in Jeremiah 39:3, 13. By Samuel Feigin. Reprint from the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Parts I and II, 1926, pp. 149-155.

Einige keilschriftliche Parallelen zu Jes. 40-66. Von Friedrich Stummer. Reprint from the same, pp. 171-189.

These two excellent articles are of first-class importance for students of the Old Testament.

S. A. B. M.

Antike Jesus-Zeugnisse (collected) by J. B. Aufhauser. Bonn: Marcus, 1925, pp. 57. M. 2.40.

Second edition of a pamphlet in Lietzmann's collection of *Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen*. The texts are given in Hebrew (with translation), Greek, Latin, and translations of Syriac texts. This is an exceedingly convenient collection for students. There is a short but reliable introduction at the beginning.

J. A. M.